



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 13, 2010

No. 103

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 13, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God without beginning or end, in the passing scene of life, help the Members of Congress to keep focused on the public trust they have been given.

May they make just and prudent decisions that will strengthen this Nation in its constitutional integrity and bring peace and prosperity in our day.

With Your blessing, may each moment of this session of Congress be dedicated to justice, and may our public service give You glory, both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms.

FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 13, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 13, 2010 at 11:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2872.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 289.

Appointments:
National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

By Robert F. Reeves, Deputy Clerk.

TOWN HALL MEETINGS ACROSS SOUTH CAROLINA'S SECOND DISTRICT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over the last week, I have held six town hall meetings all across South Carolina's Second Congressional District focused on job creation and Washington's reckless spending habits.

Residents in Aiken, Barnwell, Richland, Lexington, Orangeburg, Varnville, and Bluffton came out to express their concerns and hear the opinions of their neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the message I bring back from South Carolina's Second District residents is simple: stop this out-of-control spending and pass job creation policies that incentivize small businesses to create jobs and families to invest.

People are concerned. They are concerned about their family's economic future. They are concerned about the enormous debt being imposed on our children and grandchildren.

I encourage residents who couldn't attend to take advantage of two new interactive forums designed to give Americans a voice in Congress to share policy solutions: AmericaSpeakingOut.com and YouCut.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the global war on terrorism.

PRAISING BRIDGESTONE AIRCRAFT TIRE IN ROCKINGHAM COUNTY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to visit a North Carolina business success story last week. Bridgestone Aircraft Tire, located in Rockingham County, came to North Carolina in 2007 from Miami when their Miami manufacturing facility was taken in an eminent domain proceeding.

Bridgestone brought about 70 new jobs to the community as well as what they call its United Nations of employees. The Bridgestone employees hail from not just Rockingham but around the globe, including Colombia, Venezuela, Jamaica, Singapore, Japan, Haiti, and Honduras.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5505

Best of all, Bridgestone and its employees have been active participants in the community. Plant employees volunteer their time, recently helping to restore the local Mayo River Park to become the newest State park in North Carolina, as well as supporting local youth sports, United Way, Salvation Army, and a local charity for non-insured cancer patients.

Mr. Speaker, this facility and its dedicated, hardworking employees are truly a tremendous asset to North Carolina.

AMERICANS ARE ANGRY AT THE MEDIA

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of Americans say they are "angry" at the national media, according to a new Rasmussen public opinion poll. The poll suggests that Americans are angry because of the national media's clear liberal bias.

By a margin of more than 3-1, Americans say the average reporter is more liberal than they are, rather than more conservative. By almost the same margin, Americans think reporters are trying to help President Obama pass his agenda. Seven in 10 say most reporters try to help the candidate they want to win. And a majority think employees would hide information that might hurt a candidate they wanted to win.

Americans will continue to be angry until the national media report the facts and stop telling the American people what to think.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6 p.m. today.

SUGAR LOAF FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3923) to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3923

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District Land Exchange Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **DISTRICT.**—The term "District" means the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District of Boulder, Colorado.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "Federal land" means—

(A) the parcel of approximately 1.52 acres of land in the National Forest that is generally depicted on the map numbered 1, entitled "Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange", and dated November 12, 2009; and

(B) the parcel of approximately 3.56 acres of land in the National Forest that is generally depicted on the map numbered 2, entitled "Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange", and dated November 12, 2009.

(3) **NATIONAL FOREST.**—The term "National Forest" means the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests located in the State of Colorado.

(4) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "non-Federal land" means the parcel of approximately 5.17 acres of non-Federal land in unincorporated Boulder County, Colorado, that is generally depicted on the map numbered 3, entitled "Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange", and dated November 12, 2009.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the provisions of this Act, if the District offers to convey to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the non-Federal land, and the offer is acceptable to the Secretary—

(1) the Secretary shall accept the offer; and

(2) on receipt of acceptable title to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) shall apply to the land exchange authorized under subsection (a), except that—

(1) the Secretary may accept a cash equalization payment in excess of 25 percent of the value of the Federal land; and

(2) as a condition of the land exchange under subsection (a), the District shall—

(A) pay each cost relating to any land surveys and appraisals of the Federal land and non-Federal land; and

(B) enter into an agreement with the Secretary that allocates any other administrative costs between the Secretary and the District.

(c) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The land exchange under subsection (a) shall be subject to—

(1) valid existing rights; and

(2) any terms and conditions that the Secretary may require.

(d) **TIME FOR COMPLETION OF LAND EXCHANGE.**—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange under subsection (a) shall be completed not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY TO CONDUCT SALE OF FEDERAL LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with paragraph (2), if the land exchange under subsection (a) is not completed by the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may offer to sell to the District the Federal land.

(2) **VALUE OF FEDERAL LAND.**—The Secretary may offer to sell to the District the Federal land for the fair market value of the Federal land.

(f) **DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall deposit in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act") (16 U.S.C. 484a) any amount received by the Secretary as the result of—

(A) any cash equalization payment made under subsection (b); and

(B) any sale carried out under subsection (e).

(2) **USE OF PROCEEDS.**—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and until expended, for the acquisition of land or interests in land in the National Forest.

(g) **MANAGEMENT AND STATUS OF ACQUIRED LAND.**—The non-Federal land acquired by the Secretary under this section shall be—

(1) added to, and administered as part of, the National Forest; and

(2) managed by the Secretary in accordance with—

(A) the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the "Weeks Law") (16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.); and

(B) any laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest.

(h) **REVOCATION OF ORDERS; WITHDRAWAL.**—

(1) **REVOCATION OF ORDERS.**—Any public order withdrawing the Federal land from entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws is revoked to the extent necessary to permit the conveyance of the Federal land to the District.

(2) **WITHDRAWAL.**—On the date of enactment of this Act, if not already withdrawn or segregated from entry and appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining and mineral leasing laws) and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), the Federal land is withdrawn until the date of the conveyance of the Federal land to the District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3923 was introduced by our colleague from Colorado, Congressman JARED POLIS. Since 1967, the Forest Service has issued two special use permits to the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District to own and operate two fire stations on National Forest System land.

The District would like to own the parcels of land on which the fire stations sit in order to build an area for firefighter training and bathroom facilities. Currently, the fire stations do not have running water because State and county regulations prohibit well and septic systems on public lands for private use.

The District would receive approximately 5 acres of Federal land on which the fire stations sit, and the Forest Service would receive land of equal value from the District. A specific in-holding owned by the District has been identified for the exchange.

Mr. Speaker, we commend Congressman POLIS for his work on this bill, and we support passage of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1410

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the West there are communities struggling to provide basic services because of a limited tax base and a shortage of non-Federal lands to build infrastructure. The Sugar Loaf Fire District in Colorado has provided services to the surrounding National Forest area for years and is simply seeking a tiny parcel of land in order to make much-needed improvements in their facilities.

This commonsense land conveyance should have been handled administratively by the Forest Service. Something is not working right when cash-strapped fire districts who are providing incalculable benefits to Federal lands have to spend years and money they do not have to push for legislation for something that should be handled quickly and at the local level.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 3923, the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District Land Exchange Act. This legislation is the result of a long-term effort by the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District in Sugar Loaf, Colorado. This exchange will be of great benefit to those volunteer firefighters and the communities that they serve.

The Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District and the U.S. Forest Service have always worked closely with each other since the fire district's inception in 1967. The Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District volunteers are key first responders to both wild-land and residential fires as well as car accidents and health emergencies within the communities and the public lands that they serve.

In its fledgling start, the fire district's physical home was established in an existing building on U.S. Forest Service land through a special use permit. Three years later, a second building was constructed under another special use permit, both in important locations for accessibility to the few main roads in the mountainous areas. This bill today would exchange the small amount of Federal land on which these facilities exist with private land that has been purchased by the fire district for this transfer, land that is better suited for the scenic and recreational services of the local public lands.

While the U.S. Forest Service and these special use permits have been incredibly valuable during the over 40-year history of the fire district, it is now important that the fire district has the autonomy to better self-direct its future, invest, and ensure the modernization of its facilities.

Currently these buildings are without even the most basic amenities, like running water and restrooms, and their location on public land has precluded them from making modernizations. As the surrounding communities have grown considerably in the past few decades, these buildings have taken on added responsibility as community meeting centers, making it even more important that they be updated to accommodate this new rule, and this bill will allow for them to be updated and modernized.

I would like to thank Chairman RAHALL and Ranking Member HASTINGS, as well as Subcommittee Chairman GRIJALVA and the gentlewoman from Guam, for their hard work on this effort. It is an important measure for the local communities of my district, and I urge a "yes" vote on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to urge Members to support the bill.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3923, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR NATIONAL GREAT BLACKS IN WAX MUSEUM

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3967) to amend the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 to authorize appropriations through fiscal year 2015.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3967

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2015.

Section 3(c) of the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 is amended by striking "2009" and inserting "2015".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3967, introduced in October of 2009 by our colleague Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS, helps tell the story of the African American struggle for equality.

For the last quarter century, Doctors Joanne and Elmer Martin have worked tirelessly to create a safe, nurturing environment for Baltimore's youth. Through their work to build and fund the National Great Blacks in Wax Museum and the Justice Learning Center, they have created a unique opportunity to teach and connect with young people to tell the story of great African American leaders in the history of our United States of America.

H.R. 3967 amends the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 to extend authorization for Federal grant funding. Representative CUMMINGS is to be commended for his work on behalf of this outstanding education and outreach program.

Mr. Speaker, we support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3967 renews the authority to spend appropriations for the Great Blacks in Wax Museum in Baltimore, Maryland. A legislative hearing was held on this bill, but, unfortunately, the National Park Service did not provide us with any information about this program or the necessity to fund it. What we did learn is that this program will be funded and overseen through the Department of Justice, leaving us with even more questions, not the least of which is why this bill went through a public lands committee.

That being said, I am concerned that extending Federal spending at this time may not be appropriate until we can better understand how this program will be administered and what has been done in the last 6 years since it was originally authorized.

Finally, while I have no doubt that the Great Blacks in Wax Museum is a positive influence in the City of Baltimore, it is unclear why it is necessary to involve the Federal Government in the wax museum industry. This may be yet another highly illustrative example of why we are buried by overwhelming Federal debt.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3967, which amends the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 to authorize appropriations through 2015. This important measure will extend a program that, for the last six

years, has helped educate the public about the contributions of major African American figures in American history.

I thank Chairmen RAHALL and CONYERS for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank the sponsor of this legislation, Congressman CUMMINGS, for recognizing the importance of continuing funding for this socially significant program that promotes cross-cultural awareness and appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, black Americans have served honorably in Congress, senior executive branch positions, the law, the judiciary, and many other fields. Black Americans have also had a massive and important impact on cultural life in the United States, from television and cinema to the performing and visual arts. Unfortunately, these contributions are not well known by many in the public and underrepresented in textbooks, history lessons, and, importantly, our nation's museums.

The National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 authorized funds for the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, Inc., a museum based in Baltimore, Maryland that celebrates important black figures in American history through the medium of wax sculpture. With Congressional funding, the Great Blacks in Wax Museum has been able to further its mission of bringing recognition to black Americans who have had lasting impacts on our nation. The museum showcases black Americans such as Rosa Parks, Colin Powell, Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, Jesse Owens, Ida B. Wells, and many others.

H.R. 3967 will allow this non-profit organization to continue educating the public about the importance of African Americans to the history of the United States and ensuring that American history does not favor one race or culture over another, but rather accurately reflects the intricate racial and cultural tapestry that defines American society. This mission is one that is, without question, worthy of our support.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3967.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3967, a bill to amend the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 to authorize appropriations through fiscal year 2015. The funds, approximately \$5 million, would be used by the National Great Blacks in Wax Museum in order to build a Justice Learning Center. I would also like to commend my esteemed colleague, Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS, for his dedication to the preservation of Black American history.

In 1983, Drs. Elmer and Joanne Martin opened the doors to the National Great Blacks in Wax Museum. It is the first wax museum of African-American history in the nation, and the first wax museum in Baltimore, Maryland. The facility was created to stimulate an interest in African-American history by revealing little-known and often neglected facts of history. The founders also sought to improve race relations by dispelling myths of racial inferiority and superiority, as well as use the figures of great leaders to inspire and uplift African Americans to reach their full potential.

In 2004, the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 was signed into law. The act directed the Attorney General to make grants available to the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, in part for building a Justice Learning Center, and also for carrying out pro-

grams relating to civil rights and juvenile justice. Though the legislation passed, no funds were distributed to the museum and the museum continues to operate on funding from private donors just as it has for the past 27 years. The Justice Learning Center will serve as another venue for the museum to educate and empower citizens with information relating to Black American history. H.R. 3967 gives this Congress an opportunity to support the museum in this project.

Mr. Speaker, fellow colleagues, it is imperative that we support this bill. Should we fail to pass this legislation and appropriate funds to the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, great Georgians like Andrew Bryan, founder of the first American black Baptist church, in Savannah, GA, and Julian Bond, a former civil rights leader, United States Congressman, and recent chairman of the NAACP, would go unnoticed and overlooked along with other African-American leaders. In addition to all of the war funding, foreign aid, and domestic agendas we support, I believe our goal should also be to preserve and maintain our rich history for our children and generations yet to come. I urge my colleagues to stand with me and support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3976, an act that seeks to amend the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 to authorize more appropriations through the fiscal year of 2015. I also want to thank my colleague, Representative ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, for introducing this important legislation.

Today we acknowledge the success and importance of the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, Inc., and seek to provide it with appropriations. This bill will amend the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 to extend the authorization of appropriations for grants to the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, Inc., in Baltimore, Maryland, through 2015. This bill will also carry out programs related to civil rights and juvenile justice through the National Great Blacks in Wax Museum and Justice Learning Center.

The National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–238, 118 Stat. 670–672) directs the Attorney General to make a grant to the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, Inc., in Baltimore, Maryland, to be used only for carrying out programs relating to civil rights and juvenile justice through the National Great Blacks in Wax Museum and Justice Learning Center. To receive a grant, the Great Blacks in Wax Museum, Inc., shall submit to the Attorney General a proposal for the use of the grant, which shall include detailed plans for such programs.

The founders of the museum outlined four specific areas that they meant for the museum to cover. First, according to a mission statement they wrote, the founders of the museum wanted the Great Blacks in Wax Museum to stimulate an interest in African-American history by revealing the little-known, often-neglected facts of history. Second, the museum was intended to use great leaders as role models to motivate youth to achieve. Third, the museum should improve race relations by dispelling myths of racial inferiority and superiority. Lastly, the museum supports and works in conjunction with other nonprofit, charitable organizations to seek to improve the social and economic status of African Americans.

The museum's goals are important to achieve in our society. It is important that we

cherish and appreciate our history while looking to the future. In the process of this remembrance, we can work for a brighter future.

For the foregoing reasons, I stand with Representative ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS in support of this act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3967.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1420

COLONEL CHARLES YOUNG HOME STUDY ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4514) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4514

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Colonel Charles Young Home Study Act".

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) *STUDY.*—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary"), in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, shall conduct a special resource study of the Colonel Charles Young Home, a National Historic Landmark in Xenia, Ohio (referred to in this Act as the "Home").

(b) *CONTENTS.*—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) *evaluate any architectural and archaeological resources of the Home;*

(2) *determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Home as a unit of the National Park System;*

(3) *consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the Home by Federal, State, or local governmental entities or private and nonprofit organizations, including the use of shared management agreements with the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park or specific units of that Park, such as the Paul Laurence Dunbar Home;*

(4) *consult with the Ohio Historical Society, Central State University, Wilberforce University, and other interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, or individuals; and*

(5) *identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives considered under the study.*

(c) *APPLICABLE LAW.*—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 8 of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5).

(d) *REPORT.*—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that contains—

(1) the results of the study under subsection (a); and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4514, introduced by Congressman LACY CLAY of Missouri, directs the National Park Service to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio, as a unit of the National Park System. Colonel Charles Young was a distinguished African American officer in the U.S. Army during the late 1800s and early 1900s and the first African American to hold the rank of colonel. Young is also credited with being the first African American national park superintendent, when, as commander of the 10th Cavalry, he was sent to protect the newly established Sequoia National Park and General Grant National Park in California.

Through this study, the Park Service will thoroughly review the cultural and historical resources associated with the remarkable story of Colonel Young and determine how best to interpret his role in American history.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend Congressman CLAY for his efforts to highlight the story of this great American, and I urge the House to support H.R. 4514.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio, as a unit of the National Park Service. The bill also directs the Secretary to consider other initiatives for protection of the home and interpretation of the life and accomplishments of Colonel Young.

Colonel Young was the third African American to graduate from West Point

and had a distinguished career in the U.S. Army from 1884 to 1922, including command of troops in the Spanish-American War. Colonel Young is also the first black to serve, in effect, as the superintendent of a national park, because he commanded the Army unit assigned to protect Sequoia National Park and General Grant National Park. Colonel Young served our country with great distinction, and I hope this study will help us find appropriate ways to honor his life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4514, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ROTA CULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES STUDY ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4686) to authorize the Secretary of Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4686

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act”.

(b) *FINDINGS.*—Congress finds as follows:

(1) The island of Rota was the only major island in the Mariana Islands to be spared the destruction and large scale land use changes brought about by World War II.

(2) The island of Rota has been described by professional archeologists as having the most numerous, most intact, and generally the most unique prehistoric sites of any of the islands of the Mariana Archipelago.

(3) The island of Rota contains remaining examples of what is known as the Latte Phase of the cultural tradition of the indigenous Chamorro people of the Mariana Islands. Latte stone houses are remnants of the ancient Chamorro culture.

(4) Four prehistoric sites are listed on the National Register of Historic Places: Monchon Archeological District (also known locally as Monchon Latte Stone Village), Taga Latte

Stone Quarry, the Dugi Archeological Site that contains, latte stone structures, and the Chugai Pictograph Cave that contains examples of ancient Chamorro rock art. Alaguan Bay Ancient Village is another latte stone prehistoric site that is surrounded by tall-canopy limestone forest.

(5) In addition to prehistoric sites, the island of Rota boasts historic sites remaining from the Japanese period (1914–1945). Several of these sites are on the National Register of Historic Places: Nanyo Kohatsu Kabushiki Kaisha Sugar Mill, Japanese Coastal Defense Gun, and the Japanese Hospital.

(6) The island of Rota's natural resources are significant because of the extent and intact condition of its native limestone forest that provides habitat for several federally endangered listed species, the Mariana crow, and the Rota bridled white-eye birds, that are also native to the island of Rota. Three endangered plant species are also found on Rota and two are endemic to the island.

(7) Because of the significant cultural and natural resources listed above, on September 2005, the National Park Service, Pacific West Region, completed a preliminary resource assessment on the island of Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, which determined that the “establishment of a unit of the national park system appear[ed] to be the best way to ensure the long term protection of Rota's most important cultural resources and its best examples of its native limestone forest.”.

SEC. 2. NPS STUDY OF SITES ON THE ISLAND OF ROTA, COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

(a) *STUDY.*—The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) carry out a study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on the island of Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System; and

(2) consider management alternatives for the island of Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) *STUDY PROCESS AND COMPLETION.*—Except as provided by subsection (c) of this section, section 8(c) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)) shall apply to the conduct and completion of the study required by this section.

(c) *SUBMISSION OF STUDY RESULTS.*—Not later than 3 years after the date that funds are made available for this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the results of the study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4686, introduced by Congressman SABLON, directs the National Park Service to study the cultural and natural resources of the island of Rota in

the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The study will determine if those resources are suitable and feasible for addition to the National Park System.

Mr. Speaker, the NPS has already done a preliminary survey of the island and found some wonderful cultural resources and important natural features. The study authorized by H.R. 4686 will allow for a more complete examination of these resources and, just as importantly, provide for full public participation as the agency considers whether to recommend establishment of a park on Rota.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Congressman SABLON for his diligence in pursuing this matter, and I urge the House to support H.R. 4686.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating sites on Rota as a unit of the National Park System. With now almost 400 parks, our far-flung National Park System is already vast and, under this bill, will be extended further to include the island of Rota in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Rota's caves and prehistoric relics should be appropriately preserved and its limestone forests and sites commemorating the Japanese occupation properly managed. But it is a mistake to assume that designation as a national park is the only way or is always the best way to manage places that require special administration.

Although our good intentions adding to the park system are unlimited, our ability to pay for every conceivable new park is limited. And our ability to manage the upkeep of our existing parks is obviously in doubt. So I feel compelled to raise a note of caution about this and certain other bills that add to the already very long list of new park ideas awaiting evaluation by the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AUSTRIA).

Mr. AUSTRIA. I thank the gentleman from Wyoming for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 4686, but also H.R. 4514, the Colonel Charles Young Home Study Act, the bill previously discussed.

Just to talk about the previous bill, if I may, the bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Colonel Charles Young Home located in Xenia, Ohio, to determine if the home could be designated as a unit of the National Park Service. The Colonel Charles Young Home, built in 1859, is a national historic landmark and has been designated as the future site of the National Museum of African American Military History.

Colonel Charles Young was a distinguished officer and Buffalo soldier and the third African American to graduate from the U.S. Military Academy at

West Point. He served in the Army for 37 years, carrying out a variety of assignments throughout the U.S., Philippines, Haiti, Liberia, and Mexico. When forced into retirement—and this is very interesting—by the Army for medical reasons, Charles Young rode his horse 500 miles from his home in Wilberforce, Ohio, to Washington, DC, to prove he was fit for duty. And I can tell you I drove 8½ hours over the weekend—that same route. So that's a long way.

After petitioning the Secretary of War, Young was reinstated and promoted to full colonel, becoming the first African American to reach his rank by World War II. In addition to a distinguished military career, Colonel Young was also a professor of military science at Wilberforce University in Xenia, Ohio, and the first African American named as superintendent of a national park. Because of his immeasurable contributions Colonel Young has made to not only military history, but our American history, it's necessary we recognize his achievements by passing this legislation to determine if his home can be designated as a unit of the National Park Service.

I would like to thank Representative CLAY from Missouri for his help also on the bill. Again, I support both these bills. I thank the gentleman from Wyoming for yielding, and I strongly support, again, H.R. 4514.

□ 1430

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the CNMI, Congressman SABLON.

Mr. SABLON. I would like to thank the distinguished Member from Guam, Chairwoman BORDALLO, for assisting us and managing the bill through today's session. I also want to thank Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA, chairman on the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, and his staff for helping him bring this bill to the floor, and thank Natural Resources Chairman NICK RAHALL for moving this bill through the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation means a lot to my constituents on Rota. I would like to add to the RECORD a letter of support for H.R. 4686 from the mayor of Rota, the Honorable Melchor A. Mendiola.

Mr. Speaker, it was residents of Rota who first asked me to explore the possibility of a national park on their island. H.R. 4686 does just that. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether the cultural, archaeological, historical, and natural resources of Rota are of national significance. If they are of national significance, the bill asks the Secretary to report to Congress on the feasibility and suitability of designating parts of Rota as a unit of our great national parks system.

At the hearing on this bill before Chairman GRIJALVA's subcommittee,

Rota was represented by Teresita A. Santos, who is also Rota's representative in the Northern Mariana Islands House of Representatives. She described her island to the subcommittee. She spoke of the ancient Latte Stone Culture of the original Chamorro people at Mochan Village and Alaguan Bay Village and of the Taga quarry, where the ancients carved out the massive stones that held up their houses. She spoke of the Chugai Pictorial Cave where these same people left their drawings. She spoke of the remnant structures from the Japanese era of colonialism in the early 20th century, and she spoke of the unique limestone forests, home to rare and endangered bird and plant life which remain intact on parts of Rota; whereas, on other islands in the Northern Marianas, volcanic activity and the impact of modern-day humans have largely removed those forests.

Representative Santos also showed the subcommittee photographs of the places she was describing. The presentation was so powerful that one of the subcommittee members called Rota "a jewel." I could not agree more. But this jewel needs protection.

As the Interior Department witness at the hearing noted, Rota is today at a crossroads. Development is bearing down. Just a few miles across the ocean, a massive buildup of U.S. military forces is about to commence on the island of Guam. That growth is bound to spill over to Rota as military families look for weekend getaways and the waters and beaches of Rota beckon.

The national park study offers the people of Rota an opportunity, I believe, to make some thoughtful decisions about what is truly important to preserve. The process of public input and discussion—that will be as much a part of the study as the cataloguing of natural and cultural resources—will help the people of Rota make these determinations. And if a park is recommended and one day designated by Congress, that clear definition of what most needs to be formally preserved will also allow development on the rest of Rota to proceed with more freedom.

It is the acknowledged goal of Rota to be a site for ecotourism, so no development there will be conducted in a way that would spoil the very character of the island that draws the ecotourist. In fact, the presence of a national park, which underscores the rarity and importance of the archaeological, historical, and natural resources I have described on Rota, would itself complement and enhance this goal of becoming an ecotourism destination.

It's a win-win. We can spur economic growth, create jobs, and increase protection of significant national treasures. But for any of this to occur requires, first, the study authorized by my bill. So let us take the first step today, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4686.

Northern Mariana Islands June 22, 2010.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

MUNICIPALITY OF ROTA,

Hon. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLÁN

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington DC
DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABLÁN: Congratulations for getting the Rota National Park Study (H.R. 4686) approved by the U.S. House of Representatives Natural Resources Committee. It is an important step towards approval by the U.S. House of Representatives.

It is very important that a National Park in Rota be established as it would greatly enhance Rota's attraction as a tourist destination. It would also contribute significantly towards our overall economic development. As you pointed out, eco-tourism has been targeted as a most favorable type of tourism for Rota. A well planned and well structured national park would be the best avenue to develop Rota's eco-tourism potential. Please convey to the member of the U.S. Congress that the people of Rota support the establishment of a National Park in Rota.

On behalf of the people of Rota, I wish to thank you for your efforts and please do not hesitate to contact me should you need my assistance.

Sincerely,

MELCHOR A. MENDIOLA,

Mayor of Rota.

Ms. BORDALLO. I again urge the Members of Congress to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4686, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK LEASING AND BOUNDARY EXPANSION ACT OF 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4438) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement to lease space from a nonprofit group or other government entity for a park headquarters at San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, to expand the boundary of the Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4438

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Boundary Expansion Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. PARK BOUNDARY STUDY.

Section 201 of Public Law 95-629 (16 U.S.C. 410ee) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (e), (f), (g), and (h) respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall conduct a study of lands within Bexar and Wilson Counties, Texas, to identify lands that would be suitable for inclusion within the boundaries of the park. In conducting the study, the Secretary shall examine the natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic values and characteristics of lands within Bexar and Wilson Counties.

"(2) Not later than 3 years after the date funds are made available for the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study."; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) (as so redesignated) the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary may assign park employees to provide interpretive services, including visitor information and education, at facilities outside the boundary of the park."

SEC. 3. BOUNDARY EXPANSION.

Section 201(a) of Public Law 95-629 (16 U.S.C. 410ee(a)) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking "In order" and inserting the following: "(1) In order".

(2) By striking "The park shall also" and inserting the following:

"(2) The park shall also".

(3) By striking "After advising the" and inserting the following:

"(4) After advising the".

(4) By inserting after paragraph (2) (as so designated by paragraph (2) above) the following:

"(3) The boundary of the park is further modified to include approximately 151 acres, as depicted on the map titled 'San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Proposed Boundary Addition 2009', numbered 472/68,027, and dated November 2009. The map shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior may not use condemnation authority to acquire any lands or interests in lands under this Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4438 was introduced by Representative CIRO RODRIGUEZ from San Antonio, Texas.

The bill would expand the boundaries of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park and require a study of possible further additions.

San Antonio Missions National Historical Park was established in 1978 to preserve, restore, and interpret four Spanish missions along the San Antonio River. H.R. 4438 would expand the current boundaries of the park to include 151 acres of land that has already been found suitable for addition to the park. The bill also would direct the NPS to study other lands that might be suitable for inclusion in the park boundaries in Bexar and Wilson Counties.

The version before the House today does not include language that would have authorized the park to lease space outside the park for headquarters offices and an educational center. We have removed that provision to address PAYGO concerns.

Mr. Speaker, Representative RODRIGUEZ has been an excellent advocate for the many people in his district who hope to see this important and historic park grow and flourish. I commend his efforts, and I urge the House to support this excellent bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4438 has both fiscal and policy problems. The stated purpose of this bill is to expand the park by an additional 151 acres. The reasons for the expansion are vague, but the CBO cost estimate is fairly precise, \$4 million. Add to this another \$350,000 that will be spent by the National Park Service to determine whether it wants even more property.

The current level of Federal spending is too high to rubber-stamp the flood of plans to expand our government's property holdings. Our parks are important assets, but I question the wisdom of going further into debt to continually expand Park Service holdings while our existing parks face a \$9 billion backlog in maintenance and upkeep.

I am pleased that the Resources Committee did include one Republican amendment to prohibit takings by condemnation. However, under this bill, property owners who have not consented to being included within the expanded boundaries of this park may find themselves fending off the unwanted attention of Federal officials pursuing their land. This can be an overwhelming burden and not one with which we should yoke the American people.

I am also concerned that national parks are increasingly being used by litigation-prone environmental activists and by some in the National Park Service to control activities outside the congressionally determined boundaries of each park.

□ 1440

De facto buffer zones have been used to interfere with energy projects that are planned near and even far from national parks.

To restrain this particular abuse, Republicans offered amendments in the Resources Committee to prevent the park designation from being misused to prohibit construction and maintenance of power generating facilities, whether coal-fired, wind or solar. With some people opposed to almost any new power facility, and others opposed only to those near their backyards, this has been an escalating problem. The National Park Service has participated in killing or delaying affordable and renewable energy projects from coast to coast. Unfortunately, Committee Democrats rejected these common-sense amendments on nearly party-line votes, and those protections are not in this bill today.

Unfortunately, we are considering this bill under suspension of the rules and we are being denied the opportunity to offer amendments to salvage this flawed legislation. I urge my colleagues to exercise some fiscal restraint here today, support property rights, and oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), the author of the bill.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, and Madam Chairman, I stand here today in support of my legislation, H.R. 4438, a bill to authorize the expansion of the San Antonio Mission National Historic Park boundaries, and to authorize a boundary study that would identify possible lands for inclusion in the park within Bexar and Wilson Counties.

This bipartisan piece of legislation is cosponsored by all three of my colleagues from San Antonio, Congressman CHARLIE GONZALEZ, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, and Congressman HENRY CUELLAR. My colleague in the Senate, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, has also introduced companion legislation.

The San Antonio Missions is the largest concentration of Catholic missions in North America and serve as some of the most well preserved representations of Spanish colonial history, influence and culture in the Southwest. It is on this foundation that the City of San Antonio was established, and today the Missions serve as an important reminder of the connections to the city's rich past.

Built along the San Antonio River in the early 1700s by Spanish missionaries, the Missions became important social and cultural centers of the time. Today, four missions still stand and continue to be active parishes.

Established as a national park in 1978, the National Park Service and the City of San Antonio and Bexar County have worked diligently to restore and preserve the Missions and the surrounding river area.

After years of channelization, the area along the river is at last being restored to its natural ecosystem. Preserving the natural habitat in an urban area is hugely important and has long

been a priority of the San Antonio community. Now that this process is underway, expanding the Missions National Park to include this area is vital to creating a continuous and seamless park along the river.

This legislation will authorize the acquisition of previously identified lands currently owned, and I stress, currently owned, by the City of San Antonio and Bexar County that are suitable for inclusion in the park. These are willing sellers.

It will also authorize a boundary study for future areas. This bill will continue the deep tradition of preservation for the parks and river region, while also ensuring its future growth.

The need to prepare for this growth is clear. Just last year alone, in 2009, the park had a record-breaking year of visitations with over 1.7 million people visiting the park, a 35 percent increase over 2008 levels.

This legislation ensures that future generations will be able to walk along the river and see the city through the eyes of its past inhabitants as they look upon these historic structures and learn about the people that settled the region.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 4438.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the gentlelady from Wyoming has expressed concerns over the pending measure and the one we considered prior to it, which was a National Park Study bill. The next bill we will consider is also a National Park Study bill, and I will be pleased to support it, noting that the gentlelady from Wyoming is that bill's sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4438, the "San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Leasing and Boundary Expansion Act of 2010," as introduced by my fellow member of the Texas delegation, the distinguished CIRO RODRIGUEZ. This bill will expand the boundaries of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, adding an additional 150 acres of land to the site that preserves important pieces of Texas history.

In the early 18th Century, the five missions in San Antonio were the largest concentration of Catholic missions in North America. Built primarily to expand Spanish New World influence northward from Mexico, the missions also served to introduce native inhabitants into Spanish society. All five thrived through the middle of the 18th Century, and then slowly declined towards the end of the 1700s, through disease, inadequate military support, and increased hostility from Comanches and Apaches.

The Alamo, the most famous of the missions, is well known to all, as a shrine of Texas history. The other four missions—San Jose, San Juan, Concepcion, and Espada—have been in active operation as houses of worship since the 1800s, and are still important to the history of Texas.

In 1978, the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park was authorized by the National Park Service. At that time, the San Antonio River, which runs through much of the Park's area, was somewhat polluted. It was always planned and expected that, as the river was cleaned up, the Park would expand to take advantage of the unpolluted riverside areas. Now, that time has come.

H.R. 4438 will direct the Secretary of the Interior to study lands within Bexar and Wilson Counties in Texas, to identify lands that would be suitable for inclusion. It will also authorize the leasing of office space for a headquarters and support building, and allow the construction of an education and research center. It is only fitting that, as Mission Concepcion has recently been restored, and Mission San Jose is about to be restored, that the Park they are a part of is expanded to what it was originally imagined to be. Therefore, I strongly support this legislation, and urge my colleagues to join me.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4438, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HEART MOUNTAIN RELOCATION CENTER STUDY ACT OF 2009

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3989) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of adding the Heart Mountain Relocation Center, in the State of Wyoming, as a unit of the National Park System.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3989

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Heart Mountain Relocation Center Study Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special resource study of the Heart Mountain Relocation Center, in Park County, Wyoming.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the Heart Mountain Relocation Center and surrounding area;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Heart Mountain Relocation Center as a unit of the National Park System;

(3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the site by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(4) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives;

(5) identify any potential impacts of designation of the site as a unit of the National Park System on private landowners; and

(6) consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, federally recognized Indian tribes, private and nonprofit organizations, owners of private property that may be affected by any such designation, or any other interested individuals.

(c) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 8 of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5).

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing the results of the study and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3989 was introduced by Congresswoman CYNTHIA LUMMIS in November of 2009.

Heart Mountain Relocation Center was one of 10 Japanese internment camps set up during World War II when anti-Japanese sentiment was running rampant following the attack on Pearl Harbor. At its peak, nearly 11,000 Japanese Americans who were forced from their communities in California, Washington and Oregon, were detained in Heart Mountain's tar-paper barracks.

H.R. 3989 would direct the National Park Service to construct a special resource study to determine the national significance of Heart Mountain and the suitability and feasibility of designating it as a unit of the National Park System.

Mr. Speaker, we support the passage of H.R. 3989.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, between 1942 and 1945, Heart Mountain was one of 10 confinement facilities for Japanese Americans run by Franklin Roosevelt's War Relocation authority. At its peak, the camp confined nearly 11,000 people, most of whom were United States citizens.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a Special Resource Study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Heart Mountain Relocation Center in the State of Wyoming as a unit of the National Park System.

The park, if created, would be on Bureau of Land Management land and on land owned by the Wyoming Heart Mountain Foundation.

Former United States Senator Alan Simpson and former Congressman and Secretary of Commerce and Transportation, Norman Mineta, met each other as boys when the future Secretary Mineta was interned at Heart Mountain and future Senator Simpson was growing up in Park County.

□ 1450

Both now serve on the board of the Wyoming Heart Mountain Foundation. Under their leadership, the foundation is currently building an interpretive center that is scheduled to open next year. If the park is created, the Wyoming Heart Mountain Foundation has indicated its willingness to donate its land to the Park Service. No additional acquisition of private land is contemplated. Creation of this park has strong local support in Park County, Wyoming. And as the author of the bill, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, though the gentlelady from Guam raises an excellent point about the fact that I have questioned the propriety during these tough economic times of purchasing land in the previous bill, H.R. 4686, that is a proposal for the National Park Service to purchase land, and authorizing \$4 million to do so, whereas the Heart Mountain proposal is to donate the land if the National Park Service chooses to accept it and recommend it as a unit of the National Park Service. That is the difference in the bills, Mr. Speaker.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3989.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT PULASKI NATIONAL MONUMENT LEASE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4773) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands

within Fort Pulaski National Monument, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4773

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fort Pulaski National Monument Lease Authorization Act".

SEC. 2. LEASE AUTHORIZATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") may lease to the Savannah Bar Pilots Association, or a successor organization, no more than 30,000 square feet of land and improvements within Fort Pulaski National Monument (referred to in this section as the "Monument") at the location on Cockspar Island that has been used continuously by the Savannah Bar Pilots Association since 1940.

(b) RENTAL FEE AND PROCEEDS.—

(1) **RENTAL FEE.**—For the lease authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall require a rental fee based on fair market value adjusted, as the Secretary deems appropriate, for amounts to be expended by the lessee for property preservation, maintenance, or repair and related expenses.

(2) **PROCEEDS.**—Disposition of the proceeds from the rental fee required pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be made in accordance with section 3(k)(5) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–2(k)(5)).

(c) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—A lease entered into under this section—

(1) shall be for a term of no more than 10 years and, at the Secretary's discretion, for successive terms of no more than 10 years at a time; and

(2) shall include any terms and conditions the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect the resources of the Monument and the public interest.

(d) **EXEMPTION FROM APPLICABLE LAW.**—Except as provided in section 2(b)(2) of this Act, the lease authorized by this Act shall not be subject to section 3(k) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–2(k)) or section 321 of Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 1302).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4773, introduced by Representative JACK KINGSTON of Georgia, would allow the National Park Service to lease a small facility at Fort Pulaski National Monument to the Savannah Bar Pilots Association.

The pilots perform a vital public service, keeping the Savannah River and the harbor safe, and they have used this facility at Fort Pulaski for more

than 40 years under a special use permit. H.R. 4773 would regularize that arrangement under a lease.

Mr. Speaker, we urge support of H.R. 4773.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4773 would allow the Savannah Bar Pilots Association to continue leasing a facility at Fort Pulaski National Monument, as they have done since the 1940s. The National Park Service supports this legislation, and we are pleased that this is one piece of legislation that will not place additional burdens on American taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in the simplest terms, my bill allows the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a lease with the Savannah Bar Pilots Association for the Bar Pilots' continued use of the pilot base located on Cockspur Island at Fort Pulaski National Monument. They currently operate under a similar arrangement, and this bill simply aims to prolong the relationship between the Park Service and the Bar Pilots. Since 1940, the Pilots Association has continuously occupied a facility at Fort Pulaski which acts as a station for the pilots to move to and from the vessels that call on the Port of Savannah. The original special use permit allowing the pilots' station at Fort Pulaski was the result of a direct order from the Secretary of the Interior.

The Bar Pilots perform a vital role in the operation of the Port of Savannah. The pilots assist cargo ships navigating the Savannah River to reach the Georgia Port Authority's Garden City Terminal, which is about 20 miles from the mouth of the Savannah River. After an incoming ship contacts the pilots and a meeting is established, the pilots are ferried on one of several pilot boats, up to 12 miles, to the "pilotage grounds" outside the channel in the Atlantic Ocean, where vessels wait for the pilots. The Bar Pilots then climb aboard the ship and tell the ship's captain how to safely pass the dangerous sand bars in the Savannah River. Pilots must not only hold an unlimited Coast Guard license, but demonstrate an absolute knowledge of the river. The Cockspur Island location was chosen due to its location between the Garden City terminal and the pilotage grounds in the Atlantic Ocean.

The Savannah River Pilots contributions to Savannah can be traced back to 1760s. According to early records, William Lyford established a pilot house on Cockspur in 1768 to help ships from England carrying lumber, cattle, hogs, and poultry navigate the shallow and muddy waters of the Savannah River. By the early 1800s, trade between Savannah and England was thriving, and more able pilots were needed to help the influx of ships through the channel. In 1864, the Savannah Pilots Association was formally organized to emphasize the city's commitment to developing Savannah as a port city. Today, the Port of Savannah is the second largest container port on the East Coast, the fourth largest in the Nation, and the fastest growing container port in the United States. One out of every 14 jobs in Georgia can be directly or indirectly tied to the state's ports and over 1,700 new port-related jobs were announced in 2009.

The success of the Port of Savannah can be tied to the expertise of the Bar Pilots who guide the container ships safely into the harbor. Every cargo ship above 200 gross tons—which is nearly every ship that calls on the Port of Savannah—must have bar pilot on board.

Since 1940, the Savannah Bar Pilots Association has been entering into special use permits with the U.S. Department of the Interior for the use of the station at Fort Pulaski. The terms of these permits have ranged in length from a one-year permit to a 20 year permit that existed from 1973 to 1993. The current special use permit between the Pilots Association and the Department of Interior was entered on December 8, 2008 and expires on December 8, 2010. Because of recent changes to the Department of the Interior's policies regarding special use permits at various national parks and national monuments, the National Park Service since 2007 has been discussing with the Pilots Association a long term arrangement to enable the Pilots Association to continue to use the facility at Fort Pulaski. H.R. 4773 is the result of research done by attorneys for the Department of the Interior and counsel for the Pilots Association. The legislation will enable the Pilots Association to enter into a renewable 10 year lease with the Department of Interior, the pricing for which will be based upon fair market value for the property. The authorization for a 10 year lease will enable Fort Pulaski National Monument and the Pilots Association to continue their relationship spanning more than 70 years on Cockspur Island that has been beneficial for both parties.

Other than the location at Fort Pulaski, there is no other available land near the Savannah River entrance from which the pilot boats can reach the pilotage grounds off the coast of Georgia. Any relocation of the pilot station would result in longer transit times for vessels, increased safety risks in foul weather, possible delays in ship movements, and greater fuel usage and operating costs for the pilots and ships requiring pilotage services. H.R. 4773 does not seek to give any special treatment to the Bar Pilots. They currently operate under a similar agreement, and this bill simply aims to prolong this relationship between the Park Service and the Bar Pilots that has allowed the Bar Pilots to effectively perform the valuable public service of facilitating international commerce and economic development. Employees of the Park Service initially approached the Bar Pilots to suggest legislative action, and the Park Service has been involved in this process every step of the way. This bill will not take land out of the Park Service's protection, nor will it pose any cost to the American taxpayers. In fact, the bill requires Bar Pilots will to help with park maintenance costs. We are not aware of any local opposition.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge all Members to support the bill.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms.

BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4773.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SHASTA-TRINITY NATIONAL FOREST ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TRANSFER ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 689) to interchange the administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal lands between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Shasta-Trinity National Forest Administrative Jurisdiction Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TO THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land described in subsection (b) is transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) *DESCRIPTION OF LAND.*—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a) is the land within the Shasta-Trinity National Forest in California, Mount Diablo Meridian, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Shasta-Trinity Administrative Jurisdiction Transfer: Transfer from Forest Service to BLM, Map 1" and dated November 23, 2009.

(c) *MANAGEMENT AND STATUS OF TRANSFERRED LAND.*—The Federal land described in subsection (b) shall be administered in accordance with—

(1) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(2) any other applicable law (including regulations).

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TO THE FOREST SERVICE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land described in subsection (b) is transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) *DESCRIPTION OF LAND.*—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a) is the land administered by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in the Mount Diablo Meridian, California, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Shasta-Trinity Administrative Jurisdiction Transfer: Transfer from BLM to Forest Service, Map 2" and dated November 23, 2009.

(c) *MANAGEMENT AND STATUS OF TRANSFERRED LAND.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Federal land described in subsection (b) shall be—

(A) withdrawn from the public domain;

(B) reserved for administration as part of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest; and

(C) managed in accordance with the laws (including the regulations) generally applicable to the National Forest System.

(2) **WILDERNESS ADMINISTRATION.**—*The land transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (a) that is within the Trinity Alps Wilderness shall—*

(A) *not affect the wilderness status of the transferred land; and*

(B) *be administered in accordance with—*

(i) *this section;*

(ii) *the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and*

(iii) *the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 98-425).*

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) CORRECTIONS.—

(1) **MINOR ADJUSTMENTS.**—*The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may, by mutual agreement, make minor corrections and adjustments to the transfers under this Act to facilitate land management, including corrections and adjustments to any applicable surveys.*

(2) **PUBLICATIONS.**—*Any corrections or adjustments made under subsection (a) shall be effective on the date of publication of a notice of the corrections or adjustments in the Federal Register.*

(b) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.—

(1) **NOTICE.**—*The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, with respect to the land described in sections 2(b) and 3(b), respectively—*

(A) *identify any known sites containing hazardous substances; and*

(B) *provide to the head of the Federal agency to which the land is being transferred notice of any sites identified under subparagraph (A).*

(2) **CLEANUP OBLIGATIONS.**—*To the same extent as on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to any Federal liability—*

(A) *the Secretary of Agriculture shall remain responsible for any cleanup of hazardous substances on the Federal land described in section 2(b); and*

(B) *the Secretary of the Interior shall remain responsible for any cleanup of hazardous substances on the Federal land described in section 3(b).*

(c) **EFFECT ON EXISTING RIGHTS AND AUTHORIZATIONS.**—*Nothing in this Act affects—*

(1) *any valid existing rights; or*

(2) *the validity or term and conditions of any existing withdrawal, right-of-way, easement, lease, license, or permit on the land to which administrative jurisdiction is transferred under this Act, except that beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the head of the agency to which administrative jurisdiction over the land is transferred shall be responsible for administering the interests or authorizations (including reissuing the interests or authorizations in accordance with applicable law).*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 689 was introduced by our colleague from California, Representative HERGER. The bill authorizes an inter-

change of land between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The specific lands are located within the Shasta-Trinity National Forest and on adjacent public lands in northern California. The purpose of the interchange is to ease problems that off-highway vehicle users are having with permitting. The administration supports this legislation.

H.R. 689 originally passed the House by voice vote on June 2, 2009. The Senate has amended the House-passed version of the bill to clarify the hazardous substance cleanup responsibilities of each agency.

Mr. Speaker, we support passage of this measure with the Senate amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Congressman HERGER for his excellent work on this legislation. Working closely with many constituents who enjoy outdoor recreation, Congressman HERGER developed this bill allowing Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management officials to better manage a complex mix of administrative jurisdictions in Shasta County. This legislation will not only help both agencies, but will also greatly benefit the many families who enjoy wholesome outdoor recreation in the area, especially the many off-highway vehicle users who have been using this area for generations. Not surprisingly, the bill has widespread support among the local OHV users.

It is a rare feat to have two separate Federal agencies and the public all agreeing that a particular piece of legislation is worthy of praise. Congressman HERGER should be congratulated for this win-win legislation.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of H.R. 689. This legislation is the result of a collaborative and bipartisan effort to limit government bureaucracy and improve the management of federal lands in Northern California. For years, many of my constituents raised concerns over difficulties in dealing with two federal agencies in order to use the Chappie-Shasta Off-Highway Vehicle Area in Shasta County, California. Though the Bureau of Land Management has managed the majority of this area, Forest Service holdings within the area have led to such issues as duplicative permitting and even different opening dates for the same area. This situation has led to increasing frustration from thousands of users who come from across California and elsewhere to enjoy this OHV area.

This simple legislation provides a commonsense solution by allowing the BLM to consolidate the OHV area while the Forest Service will benefit by receiving jurisdiction over small tracts of BLM land that are already contiguous to the Shasta-Trinity National Forest.

This bill first passed the House by unanimous consent, and after a few technical changes, again received unanimous support from the Senate. Concurrence with the Senate's changes will finally allow for more efficient management of the Chappie-Shasta OHV Area and greater enjoyment of its users.

This legislation represents a win-win for taxpayers and their enjoyment of our federal lands. I thank Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER for their work in supporting this effort and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 689.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE VOLUNTEER IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4973) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize volunteer programs and community partnerships for national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4973

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer Improvement Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO IMPLEMENT VOLUNTEER, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS UNDER FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956.

(a) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 7(f) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2014.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**—Section 7 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f) is amended in subsections (b)(2)(B)(ii) and (d)(2)(C)(i) by striking “National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act of 1966” each place it appears and inserting “National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966”.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM VOLUNTEER AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1998.

Section 4(a) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Enhancement Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 742f-1) is amended—

(1) *in the subsection heading by striking “PROJECTS” and inserting “NATIONAL VOLUNTEER COORDINATION PROGRAM”;*

(2) *by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:*

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations, and in conformance with the

strategy developed under paragraph (2) and consistent with the authorities regarding gifts, volunteer services, community partnerships, and refuge education enhancement under section 7 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 741f), the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall carry out a National Volunteer Coordination Program within the National Wildlife Refuge System to—

“(A) augment and support the capabilities and efforts of Federal employees to implement resource management, conservation, and public education programs and activities across the National Wildlife Refuge System;

“(B) provide meaningful opportunities for volunteers to support the resource management, conservation, and public education programs and activities of national wildlife refuges or complexes of geographically related national wildlife refuges in each United States Fish and Wildlife Service region; and

“(C) fulfill the purpose and mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System under the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.).”;

(3) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows

“(2) VOLUNTEER COORDINATION STRATEGY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No later than one year after date of enactment of this paragraph, the Director shall publish in the Federal Register a national strategy for the coordination and utilization of volunteers within the National Wildlife Refuge System.

“(B) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—The strategy shall be developed in consultation with State fish and wildlife agencies, Indian tribes, refuge friends groups or similar volunteer organizations, and other relevant stakeholders.

“(C) VOLUNTEER COORDINATORS.—The Director shall provide, subject to the availability of appropriations, no less than one regional volunteer coordinator for each United States Fish and Wildlife Service region to implement the strategy published under this paragraph. Such coordinators may be responsible for assisting partner organizations in developing and implementing volunteer projects and activities under cooperative agreements under section 7(d) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(d)).”; and

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking “for for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2009” and inserting “for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2014”.

SEC. 4. VOLUNTEER, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS, AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) (as amended by this Act) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

“(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate—

“(1) evaluating the accomplishments of the volunteer program, the community partnerships program, and the refuge education programs authorized under this section, and of the National Volunteer Coordination Program and volunteer coordination strategy under section 4(a) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Enhancement Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 742f-1); and

“(2) making recommendations to improve the effectiveness of such programs, including regarding implementing subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (e).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4(a) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Enhancement Act

of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 742f-1) is further amended by striking paragraph (3), and by redesignating paragraph (4) (as amended by this Act) as paragraph (3).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4973, the National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer Improvement Act, was introduced by our colleague from Maryland, Representative FRANK KRATOVIL.

The National Wildlife Refuge System encompasses a national network of public lands and waters set aside to conserve habitat and protect natural resources and, consequently, plays an integral role in our national network of Federal public lands.

During these difficult economic times, the government has looked for efficient and practical solutions to lower costs while maintaining critical refuge systems services. The National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer Program serves this purpose. Last year, volunteers contributed to more than 1.5 million hours of support, the equivalent of nearly 750 full-time employees. This is better than \$7 returned on each dollar invested.

The pending measure would make the volunteer program permanent, establish a volunteer coordination strategy, and formalize a reporting schedule to ensure oversight and accountability.

I commend Mr. KRATOVIL for his important work on behalf of this initiative, and I ask Members on both sides to support passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4973. While individuals have been volunteering their time and talents to the National Wildlife Refuge System for nearly 30 years, the value of their work has significantly increased from \$1.1 million to \$30.3 million. Volunteers now perform about 20 percent of the work done on refuges, and for each refuge employee, there are nine volunteers. Without these dedicated men and women, many visitor centers would be open less frequently, fewer recreational opportunities would be available, many hunting programs would not occur, and important fish and wildlife population surveys would not be completed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4973, the National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer Improvement Act of

2010. I would like to thank Congressman KRATOVIL for introducing this important bill and acknowledging the importance of the preservation of wildlife to our nation.

This bill would reauthorize volunteer programs and community partnerships for national wildlife refuges. Volunteers are essential to the operation of these refuges and the preservation of our environment. Wildlife Refuge volunteers assist with laboratory research, photographing natural resources, conducting population services, and leading tours for visitors. Volunteers help provide important services to the public at no cost to taxpayers. Their service improves the quality of the visitor experience at our National Wildlife Refuges. This bill would also require the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to publish a national strategy for the use and coordination of volunteers.

The National Wildlife Refuge system is the premier system of public lands and waters set aside to conserve America's fish, wildlife and plants. The mission of the Refuge System is to manage a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of fish, wildlife and plant resources and their habitat. It is the volunteers that help make this mission possible and this bill will make sure that these volunteers have the resources they need. I strongly support our National Wildlife Refuge system and am heartened that so many Americans choose to volunteer their time on National Wildlife Refuges.

I feel strongly about the importance of protecting our natural world. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill in efforts to preserve our environment, one small step at a time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4973, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES FOR LOSS OF ICE IN ARCTIC

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2864) to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 to authorize funds to acquire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services specific to the Arctic for safe navigation, delineating the United States extended continental shelf, and the monitoring and description of coastal changes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2864

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 306 of the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 (33 U.S.C. 892d) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the text the following: “(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) ARCTIC PROGRAMS.—Of the amount authorized for each of fiscal years 2011 and 2012—

“(1) \$5,000,000 is authorized for use to acquire hydrographic data, provide hydrographic services, conduct coastal change analyses necessary to ensure safe navigation, and improve the management of coastal change in the Arctic; and

“(2) \$2,000,000 is authorized for use to acquire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services in the Arctic necessary to delineate the United States extended Continental Shelf.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, recent scientific findings have shown that the Arctic sea ice is shrinking with significantly smaller amounts of summer sea ice cover. Consequently, more open water space in the Arctic Ocean will be available for ship travel, which will present a changed landscape for international marine commerce and national security interests and greater accessibility to natural resources. These activities are likely to create substantial new demands on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to provide hydrographic data and hydrographic services in the near term.

I support this noncontroversial legislation to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act to give NOAA specific authorization to conduct hydrographic surveys and to provide other hydrographic services in the Arctic, and I urge Members on both sides to do likewise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2864 would authorize hydrographic surveys in the Arctic region, an area which lacks up-to-date survey data. The last major survey in the Arctic occurred more than 60 years ago after World War II. Since the majority of U.S. foreign trade by weight moves by sea and the Arctic has the potential to become a viable shipping corridor, it is essential that we support these surveys to help create accurate nautical charts.

I compliment the author of this measure, Congressman DON YOUNG, for

his leadership. This bill has been scored by the CBO as having no cost.

I urge support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the good lady for yielding.

Just yesterday, the Alaska Dispatch chronicled the increased tourist and commercial vessel traffic in the Arctic and the challenges the Coast Guard is facing in ensuring safe navigation. For example, the Coast Guard recently announced that the Polar Sea icebreaker will be out of service until next year and the Polar Star icebreaker won't be fixed until 2013. As a result, there are no adequate icebreakers to patrol in the Arctic or come to the aid of anyone in need. Simply, safe navigation in the U.S. Arctic is in a precarious state.

My bill would amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act to authorize much-needed funds for hydrographic surveys and coastal mapping of the Arctic regions.

Sadly, we still have a long way to go before we finish the job on nautically charting critical navigation regions throughout this country. The Arctic region in particular has been ignored and lacks survey data. It is my understanding, as the good lady said, the last major hydro survey campaign in the Arctic was conducted following World War II, over 60 years ago.

Currently, base hydrographic data in the Arctic is woefully inadequate and not sufficient to support current, let alone future, marine activity. With the reduction of sea ice, there's increased vessel traffic and opportunities for more drilling, and up-to-date nautical charts or coastal maps are critical for these activities.

H.R. 2864 is an effort to move this process forward by directing NOAA to acquire additional hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services to the Arctic region.

Alaska is the only Arctic State in this Nation. It makes this bill both critically important for my State and our Nation, and I urge Members to support this legislation.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, we should take this time to congratulate my colleague, Mr. YOUNG, for his work on this legislation. Also, I would like to thank the gentlelady from Wyoming. I've enjoyed managing the bills this afternoon with her.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2864, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEINRICH) at 6 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4514, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4438, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 4773, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H.R. 2864 will resume later in the week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

COLONEL CHARLES YOUNG HOME STUDY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4514) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 26, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—350

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews

Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus

Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)

Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bocieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach

Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harman
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre

McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space

Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney

Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt

Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—26

Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Coble
Culberson
Duncan
Flake
Foxy

Gohmert
Graves (GA)
Herger
Issa
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Mack
Neugebauer

NOT VOTING—56

Akin
Alexander
Barrett (SC)
Bean
Berry
Blunt
Boucher
Buyer
Camp
Carnahan
Carney
Cohen
Costello
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Deutsch
Doyle
Ehlers
Ellsworth

Fallin
Filner
Fleming
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Griffith
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Israel
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kaptur
Lee (CA)
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Maffei

Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Olson
Pence
Perlmutter
Putnam
Rehberg
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schmidt
Shimkus
Shuler
Taylor
Tiahrt
Walden
Wamp
Young (FL)

□ 1830

Messrs. COBLE, KINGSTON, NEUGEBAUER, MACK, and KING of Iowa changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 434, I was away from the Capitol in my capacity as Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK LEASING AND BOUNDARY EXPANSION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4438) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement to lease space from a non-profit group or other government entity for a park headquarters at San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, to expand the boundary of the Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 114, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—264

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bocieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)

Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harman
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (VA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)

Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch

Whitfield Wittman Wu
Wilson (OH) Woolsey Yarmuth

NAYS—114

Aderholt Gingrey (GA) Mica
Bachmann Gohmert Miller (MI)
Bartlett Goodlatte Miller, Gary
Bean Graves (GA) Murphy, Tim
Biggart Graves (MO) Myrick
Bilbray Guthrie Neugebauer
Bilirakis Harper Nunes
Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA) Paul
Blackburn Heller Pence
Boehner Hensarling Petri
Boozman Herger Pitts
Boustany Hunter Platts
Broun (GA) Inglis Posey
Brown (SC) Issa Price (GA)
Brown-Waite, Jenkins Roe (TN)
Ginny Johnson, Sam Rogers (KY)
Burgess Jordan (OH) Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN) King (IA) Rooney
Calvert King (NY) Roskam
Campbell Kingston Royce
Cantor Kline (MN) Ryan (WI)
Cassidy Lamborn Scalise
Castle Latta Schock
Chaffetz Lee (NY) Sensenbrenner
Coble Lewis (CA) Shadegg
Conaway LoBiondo Shuster
Culberson Lummis Smith (NE)
Davis (KY) Lungren, Daniel Stearns
Dreier E. Sullivan
Duncan Mack Thompson (PA)
Emerson Manzullo Thornberry
Flake Marchant Tiberi
Forbes McCarthy (CA) Turner
Foxy McClintock Upton
Franks (AZ) McCotter Walden
Frelinghuysen McHenry Westmoreland
Gallegly McKeon Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ) McMorris Wolf
Gerlach Rodgers Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—54

Akin Filner Moran (KS)
Alexander Fleming Olson
Barrett (SC) Fortenberry Perlmutter
Berry Frank (MA) Putnam
Blunt Giffords Rehberg
Boucher Griffith Richardson
Buyer Gutierrez Rohrabacher
Camp Hare Rush
Carnahan Hastings (FL) Sánchez, Linda
Carney Hinojosa T.
Coffman (CO) Hoekstra Schmidt
Cohen Johnson, E. B. Shimkus
Costello Kagen Shuler
Davis (AL) Kaptur Taylor
Davis (IL) Lee (CA) Tiahrt
Deutch Linder Wamp
Doyle Luetkemeyer Maffei
Ehlers Maffei Young (FL)
Fallin Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1838

Mr. HARPER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expand the boundary of the Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 435, I was away from the Capitol in my capacity as Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 435, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

FORT PULASKI NATIONAL MONUMENT LEASE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4773) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands within Fort Pulaski National Monument, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 0, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—379

Ackerman Garamendi
Aderholt Garrett (NJ)
Adler (NJ) Gerlach
Altmiere Gingrey (GA)
Andrews Gohmert
Arcuri Gonzalez
Austria Goodlatte
Baca Clyburn
Bachmann Coble
Bachus Coffman (CO)
Baird Cole
Baldwin Conaway
Barrow Connolly (VA)
Bartlett Conyers
Barton (TX) Cooper
Bean Costa
Becerra Courtney
Berkley Crenshaw
Berman Critz
Biggart Crowley
Bilbray Cuellar
Bilirakis Culberson
Bishop (GA) Cummings
Bishop (NY) Dahlkemper
Bishop (UT) Davis (CA)
Blackburn Davis (IL)
Blumenauer Davis (KY)
Boccheri Davis (TN)
Boehner DeFazio
Bonner DeGette
Bono Mack Delahunt
Boozman DeLauro
Boren Hinchey
Boswell Hirono
Boustany Hodes
Boyd Holden
Brady (PA) Dicks
Brady (TX) Dingell
Braley (IA) Djou
Bright Doggett
Broun (GA) Donnelly (IN)
Brown (SC) Dreier
Brown, Corrine Driehaus
Brown-Waite, Duncan
Ginny Edwards (MD)
Buchanan Edwards (TX)
Burgess Ellison
Burton (IN) Ellsworth
Butterfield Emerson
Calvert Engel
Campbell Eshoo
Cantor Etheridge
Cao Farr
Capito Flake
Capps Forbes
Capuano Foster
Cardoza Foxx
Carson (IN) Frank (MA)
Cassidy Franks (AZ)
Castle Frelinghuysen
Castor (FL) Fudge
Gallegly Kingston

Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)

NOT VOTING—53

Akin Fattah
Alexander Filner
Barrett (SC) Fleming
Berry Fortenberry
Blunt Giffords
Boucher Griffith
Buyer Rehberg
Camp Hare
Carnahan Hastings (FL)
Carney Hinojosa
Carter Hoekstra
Cohen Johnson, E. B.
Costello Kagen
Davis (AL) Kaptur
Deutch Lee (CA)
Doyle Linder
Ehlers Luetkemeyer
Fallin Maffei
Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes in which to record their vote.

□ 1846

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 436, I was away from the Capitol in my capacity as Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1722, TELEWORK IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

Mr. CARDOZA, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-535) on the resolution (H. Res. 1509) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1722) to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1850

GETTING OUT OF THE SLUMP

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, when will this House leadership take action to get us out of this perpetual economic slump and provide the economic growth that we need to create the jobs that American families need?

Unemployment nationally remains high at 9.5 percent for June, with the U.S. economy losing 125,000 jobs in that month alone. In my area of south Florida, our unemployment rate is steadily increasing to 12.3 percent.

It is time for the administration and the liberal House leadership to take a proven approach of providing tax relief for working families and small businesses while reducing the debt, which is delaying future economic growth.

Lowering the tax burden on small firms, simplifying the Tax Code, that will encourage job creation. I also support extending the \$8,000 first time Homebuyer Tax Credit, which has done so much to help revive our slow housing industry in south Florida.

Let's act now. It is overdue.

CONGRATULATING THE NAACP ON 101 YEARS OF SERVICE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the NAACP, which is holding their 101st convention, or celebrating 101 years, a century of service. I also want to affirm their First Amendment right to

make statements on the policies of groups who advocate for causes that sometimes are colored in race.

The NAACP is a fighter for justice for all people, and I was glad to be there this weekend speaking about issues dealing with the environment, civil justice and the economy.

It is also important to note, Mr. Speaker, that corporations are now showing one of the best quarterly returns that they have ever had. Businesses create jobs, and we have created an economic opportunity for them to do so. But all of the economists are saying they are sitting on their money. They are hoarding their money.

It is time now for us to stand up as Americans and work together to create jobs, just as this government has stimulated the economy by providing stimulus dollars to create thousands and thousands of jobs. Work together, not divide. That is how we will move this economy forward.

Congratulations, NAACP.

POLITICS OF PANIC

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the administration continues its assaultive crusade against the workers in the domestic deepwater drilling industry.

Yesterday, it doubled down its relentless destruction of the gulf coast energy industry by issuing yet another ill-advised moratorium on deepwater drilling. Never mind that two courts have said the first moratorium on drilling was "arbitrary, capricious and wrong."

The Federal Government furnished no credible evidence or specifics that shutting down deepwater drilling was absolutely necessary. Never mind the facts, never mind that the second edict from the administration violates the spirit of the court rulings. Never mind that this job-killing ban is more about the politics of panic than about the safety of offshore drilling.

The administration is intentionally and knowingly destroying domestic energy and making us more dependent on foreign oil. The administration is permanently sinking the jobs of offshore workers, and the President's plan is succeeding. Jobs are being lost, rigs are leaving the gulf to friendlier waters. And why? Who knows.

The second disaster of the gulf is brought to you by this administration and our own Federal Government.

And that's just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES "BUDDY" KEATON

(Mr. TOWNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy this evening because a very dear friend of mine passed away, Buddy Keaton.

Buddy Keaton has been a real fixture in the Brooklyn community for so many years. Many, many basketball players are in the NBA because of Buddy Keaton. Buddy Keaton was a person that spent a lot of time with young people, helping them to understand how important it is to go straight in life, and also how important it was to really work on your skills. But at the same time, he indicated that they needed to be involved in making certain that their academics were in order.

Buddy Keaton, as a result of his involvement, made it possible for many basketball officials to be able to officiate games. Some have gone on to the NBA and to other places as a result of Buddy Keaton and his involvement.

Buddy Keaton was truly a coalition builder. He was a person that just had a natural flair for saying the right thing at the right time. He knew how to do that.

So I say to the Brooklyn community and to the family of Buddy Keaton, and, of course, to my good friend Hank Carter and to all those who knew him in terms of his work and how hard he has worked on behalf of people, we say to his family, you have our deepest sympathy. If there is anything that we can do, please do not hesitate to reach out.

What a tremendous loss for the Brooklyn community.

THERAPEUTIC RECREATION WEEK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw both awareness and support for Therapeutic Recreation Week, which runs from July 11 to July 17. The purpose of recreational therapy is to restore, remediate and rehabilitate, all of which help to improve and maintain the physical, cognitive, social, emotional and spiritual functioning of individuals facing life-changing disease and disability.

This week serves to raise awareness of therapeutic recreation programs, promote these opportunities for those in need, and recognize the dedicated services of certified therapeutic recreation specialists. These specialists are certified by the National Council for Therapeutic Recreation Certification and serve a vital role in helping individuals facing disease and disability and helps them to achieve and maintain independence. Their services are both cost-effective and heartfelt.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the caring therapeutic recreation professionals for their selfless efforts to improve the lives of others, and encourage the public to take advantage of the many programs, workshops, presentations, lectures and receptions hosted in recognition of Therapeutic Recreation Week.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF REVEREND KENNETH MARCUS

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the service of a very influential spiritual leader within the Marietta community, Reverend Kenneth Marcus, the Senior Pastor of Turner Chapel A.M.E. Church.

Reverend Marcus came to America from the Island of Trinidad in 1975 to pursue a higher education. He received his undergraduate degree from Morris Brown College and master of business from Atlanta University. He first felt called to preach while in college, and then attended Emory, where he received a master of divinity in theology.

Reverend Marcus is very well respected at Turner Chapel, as he transformed a small church of just over 150 people to a large congregation consisting of over 6,000 members today. Most notably, the African Methodist Episcopal University in Monrovia, Liberia, conferred the doctor of divinity degree on Reverend Marcus in recognition of his impact on the city of Marietta.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Marcus's wife is also his co-pastor, the Reverend Cassandra Marcus, and I send them both my best wishes.

□ 1900

HONORING THE CITY OF EDEN PRAIRIE: THE BEST PLACE TO LIVE IN AMERICA

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Eden Prairie, Minnesota—the best place to live in America. Yesterday, my hometown of Eden Prairie was named by Money Magazine as their 2010 Best Place to Live in America. Of course, the people of Eden Prairie have known this for some time. But being true Minnesotans, we're very modest about our achievements. In fact, you usually won't hear anyone from Eden Prairie brag about our nationally recognized companies that we're home to, our beautiful lakes and rivers, or the miles of hiking and biking trails that run through town. You also won't hear anyone from Eden Prairie that brags about our award-winning schools, the civic-mindedness of our business community, or the friendliness of our citizens. In Eden Prairie, our preference is to leave that type of grandstanding to others like Matt Lauer and "The Today Show" and nationally circulated magazines with millions of subscribers.

Eden Prairie has been my family's home for close to 20 years. It's the place that I represented in the Minnesota State legislature, and now in Congress—and I can't think of a more deserving honor than being named The Best Place to Live in America.

BEWARE OF SPECIAL SESSIONS

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if I were tonight addressing the people of this country, I would say: beware of special sessions. We're not going to accomplish much between now and when we get out of here for the election in November. And the reason we're not is because of my Democrat colleagues, many of whom realize that they're probably not going to be re-elected.

And so the President and the majority in this body and the other body are going to wait until the election is over and they're going to call a special session. And when they call that special session, they're going to try to ram through things such as cap-and-trade, which is going to cost every family in this country about \$4,000 more for utility bills. They're going to try to ram through a bunch of tax increases and a whole lot of other things that are bad for the United States of America and all the people in this country.

And so if I were talking to the America people tonight, I'd say: Call your Congressman, call your Senator, and call the President and say, We don't want anything being rammed through by people who are out of office between November and January of next year.

HONORING THE SACRIFICE OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS CLAY MCGARRAH

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of America's bravest, Private First Class Clay McGarrah, who sacrificed his life in Afghanistan on our Nation's birthday in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Private First Class McGarrah, also a specialist in the United States Army, was a lifelong resident of Arkansas' Third District, where he attended Harrison High School. His loved ones describe McGarrah as a hardworking hero before he ever made his free choice to join the United States Army.

In addition to being described as a joy who brought happiness to the loved ones around him, McGarrah was also extremely patriotic and sacrificed himself for his life's passion for the military and our great Nation. Specialist McGarrah was assigned to C Company, 2nd Battalion, 508th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division in Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He deployed to Afghanistan in June.

Private First Class Clay McGarrah made the ultimate sacrifice for his country at the young age of 20. He is a true America hero. I ask my colleagues to keep his family and friends in their thoughts and prayers during this very

difficult time, and I humbly offer my appreciation and gratitude to this American hero for his selfless service to the security and well-being of our country.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BANKROLLING THE ENEMY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, a gentleman from my district, Will Bennett of Santa Rosa, recently wrote a letter to the editor of the Santa Rosa Press Democrat and made an excellent point. He noted that Afghan President Hamid Karzai had said of the Taliban, "They are not the enemy. They are the sons of this land." As Mr. Bennett points out, then who is the enemy? "Is this a pretend war," he asks.

How can we possibly win a war in which our chief ally doesn't share our vision of who is the enemy? But then you realize that maybe the U.S. approach to the Taliban is closer to Karzai's than we'd be comfortable admitting. Because in certain respects we're treating them more like a vendor than like an enemy. It turns out our own contracting practices in Afghanistan may actually be putting money in the hands of the very Taliban insurgents we're trying to drive from the country—the very people who are killing our troops, the very organization that provided safe haven for al Qaeda to plot 9/11.

My distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) and his Government Oversight Subcommittee recently completed a shocking report based on a 6-month investigation, which provides the details. At a cost, Madam Speaker, of more than \$2 billion, the Pentagon outsources the responsibility for shipping supplies to U.S. troops. And the contractor, unburdened by any meaningful government oversight, has been paying off a shadowy cabal of warlords, strongmen, and corrupt officials in order to guarantee security on Afghan roads.

The evidence is strong that the highway warlords are, in turn, paying protection money to the Taliban, who control many of the routes. Mr. TIERNEY

calls this, "Warlord, Inc.: Extortion and Corruption Along the U.S. Supply Chain in Afghanistan." And perhaps most disturbing of all, Madam Speaker, is the Department of Defense apparently has long been aware of this and hasn't done a thing about it.

As Mr. TIERNEY points out, at a time when communities here at home are crying out for investment in schools, hospitals, and other infrastructure, it's galling to think that American taxpayer dollars are supporting the kind of thuggery in Afghanistan that is quite possibly endangering our troops. It's bad enough, Madam Speaker, that the American people are being asked to pay for our failed war. Now it appears that they're being asked to pay for the wrong side.

Madam Speaker, we simply cannot sustain a counterterrorism strategy that has us doing business, however indirectly, with the terrorists themselves. It's illogical and it's unconscionable. This is just one more piece of evidence that this war is failing the American people, undermining instead of advancing our national security objectives. It's time for a radical change in our policy. It's time to bring our troops home.

□ 1910

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STAFF SERGEANT EDUARDO LOREDO—AMERICAN SOLDIER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it's my solemn honor tonight to pay tribute to an American hero and a son of Texas killed in Afghanistan in service to our country.

Staff Sergeant Edwardo Loredó died in Afghanistan supporting Operation Enduring Freedom. Edwardo was killed by injuries sustained when an IED was detonated near his dismounted patrol. Madam Speaker, IEDs are the way the cowards of the desert fight against our Americans. Sergeant Loredó was just 34 years of age, and it was just one day before his 35th birthday when he gave his life for our Nation.

This great American warrior was born and raised in Houston, Texas. He was an Army Airborne soldier. Edwardo served combat tours in both Iraq and Afghanistan and was with C Company, 2nd Battalion, 508th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 82nd Airborne out of Fort Bragg.

Now the 82nd Airborne Division has had its share of famous soldiers, from

Sergeant Alvin C. York to General James M. Gavin. But the real story of the 82nd Airborne Division is the selfless men like Edwardo Loredó—one of the thousands of paratroopers in jump boots, baggy pants, and maroon berets. They jump out of aircraft loaded with a ton of gear and stare danger right in the face. And if you are looking for peril, you will find our paratroopers there, jumping out of airplanes into the worst hellholes on the planet, finding the terrorists cowering in their caves, taking the fight to the enemy, and treading where the timid dare not go.

You see, Madam Speaker, our Airborne soldiers plant the American flag and say, The American soldier is here to defend freedom and liberty. They go to liberate, not to conquer. And you can point them to danger, and they'll jump right in. They're the Airborne soldiers of the 82nd. They're called the "All Americans," signified by their famous "AA" patch on their shoulder. Their division was first formed by soldiers from all of the 48 States at the time.

Staff Sergeant Edwardo Loredó was one of such American troopers. He graduated from Sam Houston High School and joined the Army shortly after graduation. He met his wife, Jennifer, in the Army. First Sergeant Jennifer Loredó, Edwardo's wife, was deployed to northern Afghanistan when she got news that her husband had been killed in southern Afghanistan.

This fine young couple are examples of the absolute best America has. They sacrificed so much in service for the country that they love. Edwardo called his fellow soldiers his family as well, and he loved the Army life.

Edwardo is survived by his 2-year-old son, Eddie; his 7-year-old daughter, Laura; and his 13-year-old stepdaughter, Alexis.

His family says Edwardo was an adventurer. He adored his wife and father, and he loved to cook for his family. America is blessed to have such a rare breed of man who serves as protector to his family and to his Nation.

Madam Speaker, this is a photograph of Staff Sergeant Edwardo Loredó. General Douglas MacArthur talked about such men, and he summed up their service in three words when he said, "Duty, honor, country." Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what these people will be, what they can be, and what they will always be. Staff Sergeant Edwardo Loredó lived those words. He honored his country and his family with his courage and his dedication, and he gave his life for the things he believed in.

It was once said that what we do for ourselves dies with us, but what we do for the others and the world remains and is immortal. Edwardo's sacrifice will not be forgotten by our Nation. Staff Sergeant Edwardo Loredó's name is now written on the sacred rolls of American patriots who paid in blood for this Nation's freedom and for the freedom of other nations.

Today I offer a grateful nation's thanks and prayers. We are grateful that a man like Edwardo Loredó lived and loved America. My heartfelt condolences to Edwardo's wife and children, his friends and family in Houston, and to the 82nd Airborne family. Today we honor this great American warrior's life and are humbled by his greatest of sacrifices. We are truly blessed to have called Staff Sergeant Edwardo Loredó an American.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MANY MORE 1099'S FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, it was a few months ago that Congress passed and the President signed this health care bill; 2,700 pages that I don't think a lot of people read. But if you did read it, you might have gotten to this one section, section 9006, and I will just read it very quickly.

"Expansion of Information Reporting Requirements. In General—Section 6041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(h) Application to Corporations.—Notwithstanding any regulation prescribed by the Secretary before the date of the enactment of this subsection, for purposes of this section the term 'person' includes any corporation that is not an organization exempt from tax under section 501(a).

"(i) Regulations.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations and other guidance as may be appropriate or necessary to carry out the purpose of this section, including rules to prevent duplicative reporting of transactions."

(b) Payments for Property and Other Gross Proceeds.—Subsection (a) of section 6041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by inserting "amounts in consideration for property," after "wages,"

(2) by inserting "gross proceeds" after "emoluments, or other", and

(3) by inserting "gross proceeds," after "setting forth the amount of such".

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to payments made after December 31, 2011."

A lot of gobbledygook, right? Anybody here know what that means? No, they don't. Let me tell you what it means. That section that I just read, even if you read it before we voted on

the House floor, is a requirement that every business in America, beginning January 1 of next year, 2011, will have to file a 1099-MISC for any transaction that exceeds \$600 during the course of the year.

So what does that mean? You've got a business that goes to Staples. They're going to have to keep track of every transaction that they made. If you buy, as a business, \$50 a month from Staples, you are going to have to file a 1099. If you've got a sales force, maybe they go out to a bunch of hotels or restaurants during the course of the year, you are going to have to find every one of those for all of your employees.

During this recent break that we were home, I met with one of my small business people in Michigan. Last year, they filed 10 1099s. They figure that next year—they have, I don't know, 30 people that work for them—they are going to have to file 350 1099s. Any business transaction that exceeds \$600 over the course of the year, they are going to have to file a 1099.

And what does that have to do with health care? How does that help the employees that are working there? Maybe they will have to hire some more people to fill out the 1099s, and they are going to be covered. Well, that's just crazy. This is a new regulation that's going to be put on businesses. It's going to cost a lot more money. If anything, it's going to take away from folks that have health care in America.

Now, we have some good news. There is a bill. My colleague DAN LUNGREN from California introduced a bill, H.R. 5141, the Small Business Paperwork Mandate Elimination Act. Just on the title, you know what that means versus what I just read at the beginning of my remarks. It takes this away. What the heck are we going to be collecting that information for? Well, somewhere else—I don't know what page it's in here, but of course it calls for the hiring of 15,000 more IRS agents. Maybe that's why they have to hire them, so they can look at all these 1099s that every business is going to have to file.

Now remember, when you do a 1099, it's more than just the amount. You're going to have to go get the Employer Identification Number for every business that you made that purchase. So, as I talked to my Kalamazoo homebuilders the last couple of times over the last couple of weeks, if they just happen to take their pickup and fill up at that Marathon or Speedway station every other week and it's going to be more than \$600 over the course of the year, they are going to have to get that Employer Identification Number and keep track of all those gas records. Think about the utilities, Consumers Energy, American Electric Power, I&M. All of the utility companies will have to do a separate 1099 for every business that they serve if they sell more than, in essence, \$50 worth of electricity a month to them.

□ 1920

What a nightmare.

Now, some might suggest that this is the first step to a VAT tax. That's right. The IRS now is going to assemble all this information and maybe—and remember, it says it's effective in 2012, but that means you have to start filing beginning January 1, only 5 or 6 months from now. It's the first step. It's the wrong step. We need to repeal it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RELEASE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the horrific 13th of March tugboat massacre, in which 41 Cubans lost their lives at the hands of the Cuban regime's Coast Guard.

Risking their lives to escape from the brutal oppression of the Castro tyranny, the victims and the survivors of that attack 16 years ago symbolize the ongoing struggle of the Cuban people to be free.

This anniversary serves to remind the world that the same callous dictatorship that rammed the small tugboat and turned water cannons on innocent Cuban men, women and children so that they could fall and drown to death is the same dictatorship in power today.

This is a regime that trades political prisoners like baseball cards to manipulate public opinion and advance its brutal agenda. Do not be fooled. These are not releases. They are forced exile; means by which the tyrannical rulers in Havana seek to eliminate their opponents. And in forcibly removing them, the regime, yet again, is violating the fundamental rights of these prisoners of conscience.

Having spent years in Castro's dungeons for having the courage to stand up for the basic liberties of the Cuban people, now these brave individuals will be banished from their homeland, courtesy of the dictatorship and its accomplice, the Spanish government.

Faced with this prospect, nearly a dozen of the prisoners of conscience reported to have made the list have al-

ready expressed their refusal to leave the island upon release, including Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet, a 2007 recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Years ago Dr. Biscet wrote to his fellow comrades, his countrymen, of "a movement of complacency," to use his words, a movement that, and I quote him, "tries to make Cubans devoted to freedom believe that they should applaud and be content with receiving limited doses of freedom, a movement which suggests that we Cubans do not deserve total freedom, but only small tokens of it. This movement of low expectations speculates that other fragments of freedom and democracy will automatically follow it."

While some will use this latest farce to reward the Cuban regime, those who truly support freedom and democracy will heed the wise words of Dr. Biscet.

It is no coincidence that this latest scheme promptly follows recent legislative efforts to provide an economic lifeline to the Cuban dictatorship. It is no coincidence that Fidel Castro chose this weekend to make his first public appearance in years, or to do a television interview on the Middle East to praise the enemies of freedom while attacking our democratic ally, Israel.

But this is not the first time that the regime has used political prisoners as pawns in its pursuit of infinite power. In 1978, the regime released 3,600 political prisoners in exchange for the Carter administration's easing of sanctions on the regime. Then 26 were released for Jesse Jackson in 1984, three for Bill Richardson in 1996, another one for former President Jimmy Carter in 2002, and 80 for Pope John Paul II in 1998.

No sooner were these political prisoners freed than the cells once again were then filled with those seeking freedom from Castro's tyranny.

With a recent visit from Syria's dictator and longstanding ties with fellow state sponsor of terrorism, Iran, the tyrants of those rogue states are likely sharing trade secrets on how to best manipulate foreign nations to serve their own nefarious purposes.

Syria, like Iran, is seeking nuclear capabilities, other nonconventional weapons, ballistic missiles, and it actively supports Islamic extremists.

Similarly, Cuba provides safe haven to known extremists from around the world and continues to publicly defend violent organizations such as the FARC in Colombia.

The anti-American, anti-democratic, anti-freedom agenda that these dictators have in common presents a threat to our U.S. national security interests.

Let us not be fooled, Madam Speaker.

For the sake of all those who have been victims of the Cuban tyranny—including Americans like Alan Gross and the members of Brothers to the Rescue murdered by Castro's thugs in February 1996—the United States must not, and cannot, fall for this latest façade by the Castro regime: Until all political prisoners are liberated; all political parties, labor

unions, independent media are allowed to operate freely; and, all Cuban people are able to fully exercise their universal rights, maximum pressure must be exerted on the Cuban tyranny.

UPHOLDING THE RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, while these young folks are setting this up for me, I want to start off tonight by talking about what we've been talking about in this hour now for close to a year, and that is that the United States is a Nation of laws, not of men. It was designed by our Founding Fathers to be such. It is something we are proud to be a part of. It's something we are proud to step up to the plate and say we defend because we believe that the rule of law is more fair than having individuals set their own rules as kings and dictators do. And so, the rule of law is a sacred part of our institution.

We say that the people will elect representatives to represent them in this Congress and in State legislatures across the country and other legislative or quasi-legislative bodies to speak on their behalf, to vote on their behalf, and to set up laws and rules which establish what a civil society will be and what we will consider right and wrong in our world.

This is a simple concept, arguably, a biblical concept going back for centuries and centuries, in fact, thousands of years. There have been sets of rules in every society, every culture, and every religious background, sets of rules that are established that allows society to function.

The rule of law is important to America. In fact, it is the underpinning that allows me and other folks like me who are blessed to be able to serve in this Congress, allows us to do this job because we stand on that rock, that the law in this country is something that we enforce.

In fact, we take an oath to preserve and protect and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. And we take that oath freely because we're saying, the basis of our legal structure, the ground rock of the rule of law, is the Constitution of the United States, which was adopted by this country and formed our Nation as we presently know it.

So we've been talking about that Members of Congress, administration people, and others need to be dealt with in the light of the rule of law, and when there are questions that should be raised, they should be raised publicly.

And so tonight, as I've done on many occasions in the past, I'm going to talk about some things that are concerning me, concerning others who care about

the rule of law. I hope to be joined by some of my colleagues here tonight.

But to start off with, I'm really concerned about what's being reported by the Obama administration, with the political backing of the Democrats in this House.

□ 1930

We are arguably seeing one of the most lawless political crusades in American history. Blatantly, this administration has violated both the spirit and the letter of the law in advancing a theory of European-style socialism on State governments and on the unwilling people.

The administration's ignored two Federal court orders that have just come out, and have ignored both of them now, saying that the drilling ban in the Gulf of Mexico is arbitrary and capricious and wrong, and ordering the United States and the Secretary to withdraw and lift that drilling ban. And yet the minute these two courts, both a Federal district court and a United States court of appeals, the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, told this administration, this President and this Secretary, that they were to lift the drilling ban and save the between 140,000 and 250,000 jobs that are connected with that industry along the entire stretch of the Gulf of Mexico, that it was arbitrary and capricious to ban all drilling and it should not be done, they immediately amend and reissue another drilling ban in the face of that court.

The administration blocks Louisiana's efforts to proceed to fight their own environmental fight by trying to throw up a little small rock barrier and a sand barrier to maybe keep the oil from getting into the marsh. It's bad enough when this oil stacks up on the beach because it makes tar balls, and it makes nastiness on that beach. It makes that beach very ugly. But you know what, it just gets on your feet and gets your feet dirty, and it just picks up.

But when it goes in the marsh, when this oil goes in the Louisiana marsh, it affects an entire ecosystem that has to do with our shrimping industry, our oyster industry, our fishing industry. It has to do with the ecosystem of the entire State and the Gulf of Mexico because there is a lot that flows in and out of that marsh that has to do with the ecosystem of the gulf. And when oil gets in amongst those grasses and amongst those habitats, it kills. On the beach it probably causes some terrible environmental impact, but nothing like going into those marshes.

So Governor Jindal says let's do something about it, and our administration blocks it. And international companies call out and say we have material to help clean up, and the administration refuses to allow them to come.

The administration refused to allow the United States Senate to conduct a single hearing over the appointment of

Dr. Berwick to head Medicare at the same time that this Congress and the President plan cutting Medicare by \$50 billion, and putting a man in charge of Medicare that there is a lot of questions that should have been asked by the Senate. But using a recess appointment, which is legal, it's legal, but in the face of what's facing Medicare and in the face of the conversation we just had earlier with Mr. UPTON about the massive burdens that are going to be created by this ObamaCare bill that has now been signed into law, and just the burdens on industry and business that are going to be put on there for really no good understandable reason, you've got to ask the question why you put a guy in there who says the things that Mr. Berwick has said and then don't allow the Senate to ask questions about that. I think that's something we ought to be concerned about.

We have a Supreme Court opinion, a recent Supreme Court opinion, that protected certain First Amendment rights of free speech, and this Congress and this administration immediately brought to this floor and shoved through on a partisan vote a bill called the DISCLOSE Act, which gives special free speech rights to some and bars other groups from having the same rights, which is in the face of a Supreme Court opinion that's taken place this summer. And so you have to say what is it about "no" that you don't understand? But you know, this is the way we are operating.

This administration has filed a lawsuit against the State of Arizona to try to block them from enforcing their laws and Federal laws with specific provisions against discrimination in any form or fashion, and profiling in any form or fashion, but to just try to save their State from the invasion that happens nightly and from the slaughter of American citizens that has happened over the last couple years, and the multiple slaughters across the border.

The administration's refused to defend the Republic against the most egregious violations of voting rights since the Civil Rights Act was passed. And we all saw them on television. It's kind of like we used to wonder how you were going to get the guy that shot Lee Harvey Oswald, ever get him a fair trial when the whole world saw the shooting on television. Well, the whole world saw these two guys, one with a club, standing out in front of a polling place, intimidating voters. And yet this administration says that they don't see any harm in that, and they are not going to enforce it.

So we are going to go through some of these things tonight and talk about them. And the first one I just brought up: the voting rights violations are ignored. Attorney General Eric Holder, who is right now very proud to be out suing the State of Arizona, dropped the case that, hey, I will ask you, if you can see this clearly, if you will look right there, you will see a club or a shillelagh or a baton, but it is, if you

go down to the gun store you can buy that weapon. So it's clearly a weapon.

Then if you would watch the film, you would hear the intimidating language that's going on there, and yet this is dropped. And it's a blatant voting rights violation. Refused to sentence the Black Panthers to default judgment. These guys were sued and didn't even show up. And it was a default judgment got against them, and then they dropped it. They didn't even have to work to get something against these guys. These guys lost. I mean, a fresh-out-of-law-school, brand-new lawyer can handle a default judgment and get recourse against these people. But the Justice Department chose, after these guys defaulted in the lawsuit, to drop the suit. I think this is a blatant disregard of something.

Civil rights is an issue that when we say the term "civil rights" of course we remember what developed in the sixties, of course we know where it came from. Of course we know it had to do with the treatment of African Americans in this country initially. But it was not written just for African Americans. It was written for Americans, every kind of American. And then an off-shoot of civil rights is the Voting Rights Act, which protects every American's right to freely vote.

Now, if two guys dressed in paramilitary uniforms, carrying clubs, are standing in front of a polling place and intimidating people and making them afraid to go up to that polling place, why in the world wouldn't it be the duty of our Attorney General, the man who is sworn to represent us in this type of law and to represent us being the American people and the Federal Government, why wouldn't they pursue this?

And that's why I say this is blatantly avoiding, ignoring, of not doing your job and doing your duty to this country to preserve the laws.

□ 1940

So if one man, Eric Holder, makes the determination—and maybe a couple other lawyers in the office, I don't know. There are a whole bunch of them over there. But if he made the decision not to enforce this law, is that a rule of law or is that a rule of men?

Now, you'll hear prosecutors say every prosecutor determines what's a good case. That's true. But they have a civil suit already that they already won, okay. I mean, they didn't have to do anything but take it to judgment, and they didn't do it—much less go prosecute the other violations under the Civil Rights Act.

So you have to ask yourself: Is this the rule of law or the rule of Eric Holder? And if it's the rule of Eric Holder, then it's not what this country is designed to be. It's not designed to be the rule of Eric Holder. It's not designed to be the rule of Barack Obama. It's not designed to be the rule of George Bush or any other President or leader of this country. It's designed to be the

rule of law. And this body has an awful lot to do with what is in that body of law that's called a rule of law.

And if we are going to arbitrarily and capriciously make changes or choose how we're going to enforce the law, I would argue that we're going down a slippery slope, and that slippery slope could lead to real disaster for this country, because if Eric Holder made this decision based on some personal decision that he has, what's to prevent the next Attorney General to have a different personal opinion and avoid some other law that's important to the rights of the American people? I don't know.

So it's the Office of Attorney General we need to be talking about. And what's their job? And I would argue their job is to enforce the law. And if there is any question as to whether or not this is intimidation—and I would almost guarantee you there is—that's for a jury or a judge to decide in a court of law; not for a group of lawyers sitting around a back room someplace deciding which group you want to protect. That's not the way it's supposed to work.

I would hope that the Attorney General will be taking another look at this. And if he thinks there is any way anybody could think this guy with a club is intimidating somebody under the Civil Rights Act, then let a trier of fact make that decision and do your job and present your case in court like a good lawyer should, and let's find out just what the courts that we trust with these decisions have to say about it. I'll accept that. I think that's right. That's the way it's supposed to operate.

So there's one blatant avoidance of the law.

Now, let me start off—because I like to be straight as I can be. To do a recess appointment—it's been done in the past. I can certainly tell you the last administration did it. Other administrations have done it. Using that method is not what I have a concern about because the President absolutely has the right to do it.

Now, he picked sort of a brief recess but, hey, that's okay. It's been done on brief recesses in the past. So that's all right. I'm not complaining about that.

But one of the things we've got to ask ourselves is, when the President of the United States told the American people what was in that 2,500-page bill that NANCY PELOSI said we were going to have to pass so we'll find out what's in it because she didn't know and neither did anybody else in this House, now we're getting to know what's in that bill.

But the promises that were made by the administration were a lie. And one of those promises was there are no death committees. There's nobody going to be deciding your life or death. Nothing in this bill is going to create or have someone in charge that's operating this bill that believes that rationing your health care and making

decisions about whether or not you get treated—that's what we were promised. The President of the United States himself told us that on multiple occasions. And not only the President, but almost everybody that represented what was in this bill said, We're not in the business of rationing health care. This bill's not going to ration health care. That's what they said. That's what they all told us.

Now, who's this guy Donald Berwick who's now been put in charge of Medicare and Medicaid? He's a proponent of the British health care system and believes in rationing your health care and redistributing wealth. What he said, and if you watch—I know it's on FOX; I hope it's on all of the channels, his statement about how he viewed health care. He basically said health care, by its very nature, requires you to have some form of rationing and a redistribution of wealth from the more prosperous to the least prosperous. It's the very nature of the beast, he said. He told us rationing health care is inevitable.

Now, wait a minute. We were promised by the President of the United States that we were not talking about rationing health care. Why would the first guy put in charge of this be a guy who publicly endorses rationing health care?

You know, I was talking about rationing health care back home, and I was surprised to learn that people didn't get the whole concept. So let me give you an example, okay, and I've given this example before.

My wife was born and raised in the Netherlands, in Holland, where they have socialized medicine and have had socialized medicine since the Second World War. My mother-in-law, who lived a long time—into her nineties—she lived under a system of socialized medicine. And she was healthy enough and so desirous of seeing her grandchildren that, even when she was really struggling with a lot of health issues, she still flew to the United States to be with her grandchildren and to be with her daughters. She's got a daughter here and a daughter in Florida. My wife's one of her daughters.

My mother-in-law, back when she was in her mid to late eighties, was suffering from anal polyps—not a pleasant thing to talk about—and she was having a lot of bleeding issues, and she went to the health care people in the Netherlands. And when she came to the United States, she was still—she'd been treated with a drug that they gave her for almost a year, and it had not changed her situation at all. Very embarrassing for a very nice woman to have this situation.

So we took her to a Dutch doctor that we knew that worked in Austin, Texas, and spoke Dutch, and we had gotten to be friends with him. And he went in and talked to my mother-in-law about it, what it was, and when he came out he said, You know, he said, this is a shame. They're treating your

mother—he's talking to my wife—with sulfa drugs. Now, we haven't treated people with sulfa drugs since the Second World War because we have antibiotics. And sulfa drugs were our drugs of choice in pre-antibiotic days, but at a time when you're 88 years old and it costs the system a lot of money for antibiotics to fight this bug, just treat the old person with sulfa drugs because, quite frankly, she's not worth the investment. That's rationing.

So being in the United States of America, the doctor immediately prescribed two antibiotics. Two weeks later, my mother-in-law was cured after a year of suffering with this situation. That's rationing. That's a governmental agency making a decision what drug you get for your illness.

And we've got a guy that we just put in charge of the health care for our elderly and the health care for our poor, Medicaid. So our needy and our elderly are now under the charge of a man who says a health care system, by its very nature, has to have rationing in order to be fiscally able to function; in other words, in order to pay the bills. And we have been promised that this wouldn't happen.

So what rule am I saying this is a violation of? It's not a rule that—they followed the rules. But it's the spirit of the thing, that the Senate should have been able to at least ask a few questions about these statements which were promised weren't going to happen. And I think the American people deserve to have those questions answered, so that's something else.

We have had one of the worst, if not the worst, environmental disaster in the history of the United States on British Petroleum's poor management and poor operation of their offshore drilling resulting in an oil spill that is catastrophic.

□ 1950

We are in like the 95th day of that oil spill right now. We have a new procedure being worked on as we speak and we're hopeful it will help. But it doesn't matter. We have poured millions of barrels, not gallons but barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico; and the consequences, we are beyond thinking about.

But one of the problems is the action of the Obama administration because of this one leaking oil well. Now, it is kind of interesting that the United States has drilled, according to what they are reporting today, 42,000 plus oil wells in the Gulf of Mexico, and the United States, the United States drilling area, has had one drilling mishap, and that's the one we're dealing with today. One in 42,000 is what the record is, right now.

So the question is, what should we do about it? Well, I would argue, and this is not hard stuff, plug the well, which has got to be done a certain way and I think they're ultimately going to do it. I'm not pleased with their performance. And secondly, under the Oil Spill

Act, the Federal Government took control of oil spills. We have a written law, the Oil Spill Act, and it puts one person in charge of making sure that all the resources of America, and anywhere else we can get, I would argue, are to be put in to clean up that mess. And under the Federal Oil Spill Act, the President of the United States is in charge of that. It's his jobs. BP's got to stop the oil drilling and they've got to pay damages, but the United States has got the duty under the Oil Spill Act to clean up the mess. And they have a way to try to collect on who will pay the damages. I'm not talking about a damage issue. I'm talking about who says to clean up boat number 5, go out there and clean. How about you number 10, go clean. Number 100, go clean. Number 1,000, go clean. Who says that? The Federal Government does that.

Okay. We are close to 100 days into this oil spill and the responsibility for the cleanup belongs to the Federal Government. Now what is the solution that our administration, the Obama administration, has come up with? We're going to put an oil drilling moratorium and shut down all oil drilling in the gulf. Later they tried to amend it to make it deep water only. But what happens when you do that, when you say the power of this government says stop drilling, what do the people who are in the gulf do? Stop drilling.

Now I can't tell you the number of drilling rigs we've got in the gulf, but it's a lot. Deep water, we have in the twenties or thirties or forties out there, in deep water. Those are the big expensive drilling rigs. But all of them cost a lot of money, even the shallow water rigs. We shut down drilling in the gulf, started making accommodations for the shallow water people, but interestingly enough, since that occurred, nobody, not one person, has been issued a permit to drill out there. So they may have told them they could drill but they haven't issued them a permit to let them drill, so, quite honestly, nobody's drilling.

Now what this means to the economy of the Gulf of Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, possibly portions of Florida, is that a lot of people are going to lose their jobs. The public number that they're giving out is 140,000, but that I believe is the number that was determined in Louisiana alone. I asked the question of a person very knowledgeable at the Chamber of Commerce in Houston, Texas, what they thought this—what could ultimately end up as a permanent ban out there, or at least a long-term ban—will do to Houston, and they said 250,000 jobs.

Now is this what you do in a time of recession? At a time when unemployment is at record numbers? I don't think so. But they did. They issued a moratorium. And they were taken to court. And the Federal district court said, No, lift that moratorium, this is arbitrary and capricious, and it is the

wrong thing to do. Lift it. Well, of course, not being willing to take no for an answer, they took it to the appellate court, Fifth Circuit, in New Orleans. Lo and behold, the Fifth Circuit said, No. The trial court is right. It's arbitrary and capricious. Lift that drilling ban. You're doing harm by having that drilling ban.

And Secretary Salazar steps up, makes a few adjustments to zero in on some deep water rigs, floating deep water rigs, and issues another moratorium. Now first, I think there are probably a bunch of judges both on the Fifth Circuit and in the district court that ought to be asking Mr. Salazar, "Secretary Salazar, excuse me, sir, but what is it about no that you don't understand?" I have asked that of lawyers who argued in my court from time to time, and I think that question ought to be asked: What is it about no that you don't understand? We've told you this is an arbitrary and capricious and way beyond the scope of what you should be doing here and you're doing it anyway. Why don't you understand the word "no" when people you are supposed to be answering to are telling you no? I think that's a question that's valid, and I think that's a question that we as people who defend the rule of law, we ought to be asking that question. I don't think we have an answer, but I do know what they did. They issued another moratorium.

Now those who would defend the moratorium would say, yeah, but they've lightened it each time. The issue is at some point in time until the playing field is cleared, the people who operate those rigs don't know if they're in trouble or not in trouble if they start to drill. They don't know. Because this keeps in the court system.

See, one of the real crimes that happens in this country and happens in every part of the country now, even including politics, is we use our courts as a weapon, sometimes when we really have no real position in law that would allow us to do so. We used to have a saying back where I come from that any idiot can file a lawsuit. All he's got to do is have the price of the filing fees and directions to the courthouse. That doesn't mean it's a good lawsuit, but defending that bad lawsuit can be so economically depressing to whoever's getting sued that ultimately that becomes a weapon, and even though they would have won if they had contested, the cost of contesting it becomes a weapon.

Well, now in this case, they've gone to court. They've been told by the court it's arbitrary and capricious. They've been told by the appellate court it's arbitrary and capricious. They've done it a third time. Now if you're a driller sitting on a drilling rig that costs somewhere between a half a million and a million dollars a day just sitting there and not operating, if you are that owner operator of that drilling rig, do you know if you can drill the day after the district court ruled? No.

Because you've got the appellate court. Do you know you can drill after the appellate court ruled? No, because they've issued another moratorium.

Now eventually that guy that's running that rig says, you know what, this is costing me somewhere around a million bucks every 2 days. I can pick this thing up and I can go over as I believe was announced by a group, Diamond or something like that, Diamond drilling rig, Diamond offshore drilling pulled their rig out today and moved it off the coast of Egypt.

Well, why wouldn't you? Is it good business to lose half a million dollars a day? Because people are clouding the waters so much or clouding the environment so much that you don't know whether if you start drilling, they're going to come drag you off and throw you in jail for violating a moratorium. I mean, that's why the drilling rigs aren't drilling. That's why they're pulling out and moving to other places. So at least Diamond is going off the shore of Egypt. Others will move off the shore of Australia. Others will move off the shore of Europe, into north Africa. Others will move off the shore of Libya; off the shore of Brazil.

□ 2000

Now, what is wrong with this picture? What is wrong with this picture? We all attach to the same oceans. The rest of the world is drilling. And we have had two courts of jurisdiction say, no, you can't have a moratorium. Why do we have a moratorium? Because I would argue that Secretary Salazar is ignoring the courts and ignoring the rule of law, and we ought to be concerned about that.

It has nothing to do with defending British Petroleum. They ought to get hammered every way they can get hammered, because they actually did some very bad business practices, it is going to prove out, I think. But we will have to see the proof. But still they have to pay for the damages they have done, which they have agreed to do, by the way.

Let's talk about another issue that in Texas at least is on our minds 24/7, and that is the issue of what is going on at our borders. President Barack Obama made a speech about 10 days ago that specifically raised this issue of immigration. He talked about we needed to do a comprehensive immigration plan and that we were defending our borders better than we have ever defended them, ever; that we have improved the situation greatly.

In the interest of fairness, I would argue that maybe he should have mentioned that the day before he made this announcement that there had never been a better defense of our borders, automatic weapon fire hit the city hall of El Paso, Texas, fired from across the border at city hall. I think at least in the order of fairness, we should have known that, well, except for maybe the fact that for the first time since 1919, the City of El Paso has been fired upon from across the border.

By the way, in 1919 when they did fire across the border, the American troops went across the border and cleaned out Juarez, in fact chased Pancho Villa, and they all came from right there at Fort Bliss, and we are sitting with 24,000 experienced combat soldiers at Fort Bliss right now. I am not saying he should have called them out. I am just saying let's paint the picture accurately.

Even if it is true that we have got more resources on the border than ever, and I think there is something to that, we have also had a massive escalation of what is going on across the border from our southern border States.

The cartels that promote and sell various sorts of drugs, and being an old judge I have tried more drug cases than 10 times the number of seats there are in this room, but I can tell you that when the cartels moved to the Mexican border, especially that strip of border between El Paso and Brownsville, we have got two, arguably three cartels fighting for who will control that area. Each of the two major cartels formed hit squads, separate organizations like Murder, Incorporated, when they used to talk about the Italian Mafia, and these groups became the murder squads, going out and killing not only other cartel members from the opposite cartel, but also killing Mexican police officers and Mexican army military people, Mexican civilians, kidnapping Americans, et cetera. Now those hit squads are thinking about becoming cartels themselves, so we have a real Wild West shootout going on across the border from where we live.

Now, I didn't mean that to be humorous. But the week before the firing on the El Paso city hall, 21 people were killed in one day in Juarez, Mexico, in gun battles. I am sorry, but if you will check Afghanistan and Iraq, the number of days that 21 people were killed, there were very few, in one day. So arguably we have got a situation in a city of almost 2 million people directly across the Rio Grande River from the State of Texas that is frightening.

Senator JOHN KYL says that President Obama told him, the problem is, if we secure the border, then you all won't have any reason to support comprehensive immigration reform. The White House denies that. Senator KYL sticks with his story. I don't know. But the issue that we really need to be talking about is defending our border, and I would say we are refusing to defend our border.

Arizona enacted a law to actually enforce the immigration laws the Federal Government has failed to enforce. Attorney General Eric Holder and the Obama administration have filed a lawsuit against Arizona saying it has no right to enforce that law. This is going to be a question that is going to be settled by the courts. How many times have I said on this floor I respect the decisions of the court? So we will certainly see how it comes out.

But why did the Arizona legislature and the Arizona Governor put this law forward? And why, by the way, did they take this law and track, according to multiple experts, word-for-word the enforcement provisions set out in the Federal law as far as the actions of Federal agents and what they can and cannot ask someone? Why does it track word-for-word the Federal law? Why did they pass this with specific provisions saying that we will not do any kind of profiling of any sort, racial or otherwise, and it can only be done as a result of a lawful stop on other matters, can you ask a question about the immigration status of the person you are talking to, or what country they come from.

So, you say, why did the legislature pass this? Why is the Governor stepping up and doing it? Because they have been begging in Arizona, please, come help us. You guys are not stopping this flow of people.

We had a rancher brutally murdered in his own living room for standing up to these drug lord caravans coming across the border bringing people and drugs into the United States. And the guy, all he did, he was out on his land, he told these people, you are not supposed to be here. And they killed the guy.

In Texas, we have a river between us. They have a barbed wire fence between them and Mexico, and we have got a river between us.

I have friends, I talked to a good friend of mine, a former county commissioner in my home county, who told me that at his place at Carrizo Springs down close to the border, that he leaves food and water out for people because he doesn't want them tearing the place up. He leaves the place unlocked because there used to be mostly economic people looking for a job coming through there and all they wanted was something to eat and something to drink. But now these thugs are coming across the border stealing everything not nailed down and tearing the place to shreds, these lawless people that come across our border.

□ 2010

Now, maybe that's why the State of Arizona has said, You know what? You guys in the Federal Government are not doing your job. We're going to help. And I haven't heard anybody say that if they ask someone, Are you an American citizen, and they say, No, I'm from Guatemala, or whatever, and they say, Well, we're going to call the Border Patrol. At that point, that's where their participation stops, the way I understand it.

Whether the Border Patrol is going to do their job, well, that's going to be a whole different issue. But it's going to be decided by the courts. But I just think really and truly the real solution to the Arizona problem is for the Federal Government to enforce the laws that are on the books. The laws are on the books right now.

And I was thinking about this coming over here tonight. I will make a slight presumption, but it's not much of a presumption, that possession of cocaine in Arizona is against the law—especially large amounts. I would make the presumption that possession of marijuana in Arizona is against the law. I think there's a good presumption by an old judge from Texas that possession of heroin in that State of Arizona is against the law. I do think under those circumstances, if those are written into the code, which I presume they are, they are probably felony cases of a serious nature. I think that carrying automatic weapons, fully automatic weapons, is both against the Federal and the State law in Arizona. I'm pretty sure. I know they are in Texas.

Now, if people are coming across our border armed with AK-47 weapons, backpacks full of drugs, marching in caravans, in many cases dressed in uniforms—paramilitary uniforms—marching into the public lands of Arizona and I guess turning over to some motorized operation they want to that takes it and spreads that filth all over the country, the State of Arizona has the right to enforce, if nothing else, the drug laws of Arizona. And I would argue if they don't have the resources to stop this epidemic of violence and drugs and prostitution and smuggling of individuals from every part of the world into our country, if there's not enough law enforcement personnel to put on the ground to enforce those laws, which they have absolutely the right to enforce, they ought to be able to call out the Guard to do it, as long as they abide by the posse comitatus laws.

So this is just after you have caught the drug dealer with a pack full of heroin and an AK-47 on his shoulder. How bad is it to ask, Oh, by the way, are you an American citizen? I don't know. First off, you don't have to call the Border Patrol. Throw them in jail and prosecute them for violation of State law. So this thing is kind of out of whack a little bit, by my way of thinking. But the real shame to me is suing Arizona.

Finally, we spent almost a year and a half talking about, dealing with, and behind closed doors, writing of the majority party's bill for health care reform. And in that bill we basically mandate that the government will tell people what product they will buy and who they can buy it from. As a result, the individual mandate extends the commerce clause power beyond the economic activity to economic inactivity. That is unprecedented. In other words, what they're saying is, If you don't buy this product for your employees, you're going to be punished with a \$2,000 fine. And the question becomes: Is this commerce as the commerce clause of the United States is written?

Basically, we have expanded the Federal Government probably farther

under the commerce clause than any other single clause in the Constitution. And now, using the commerce clause as an argument, the argument in here is that you can make an employer buy a product sold by a company or your choice of companies, or if they don't buy it, they get fined. And the question is, Where does that stop? If that's the law, why can't we make everybody buy a Chevrolet? I don't know. Why can't we? If we can make them buy Blue Cross or some other company's policy or be fined \$2,000, why can't we say everybody that buys a car in America next year has to buy a Chevrolet or a Buick or a Ford? Let's not get in trouble with the auto manufacturers. Or, I don't care what. You have to buy one or they pay a \$2,000 fine. If they can do it on health care, they ought to be able to do it on automobiles, shouldn't they? Where does it stop? That's the kind of issue we've got to ask ourselves as we look at this.

Never before has the Congress used its commerce power to mandate that an individual person engage in an economic transaction with a private company. Regulating the auto industry or paying cash for clunkers is one thing; making everyone buy a Chevy is quite another. This is in *The Washington Post*.

But the real question we have to ask ourselves is: How are we marching over human rights in this country, individual rights—the real thing that sets us apart from the rest of the world? How are we stepping all over people as a government. And shouldn't we be concerned about stepping all over people? And I've lost count, but I know it's in the teens of people who have filed lawsuits against the Federal Government in at least two jurisdictions, and maybe three, saying this is unconstitutional; you can't do this.

Shouldn't we be thinking about all this? Shouldn't we wonder if the rule of law prevailed in other parts of that 2,500-page document we call the ObamaCare or health care bill? Because when we wrote that bill, we created some of those laws that are the rule of law. And the rule of law has to comply with and be supported by the United States Constitution, because that's the rock we build our laws upon.

So as we finish up talking today about the rule of law, I bring these issues up so that this House and others can ponder them and say, As we continue to march down a corridor which steps all over the rule of law, where does it stop? And where do we stand up and say, Wait a minute, that's not right. Wait a minute. When a court tells you something and orders you to do something and then you appeal it and the appeals court tells you the same thing, then what is it about “no” that you don't understand? When Governors are trying to save their environment, why are you getting in the middle of their business and not letting them build a berm. Why aren't you helping them?

We've got issues we've got to talk about as far as the overreaching of this Federal Government, and I think we will. I think we will be discussing them this fall in a pretty serious manner.

Madam Speaker, my time is almost done. I thank you for the time you've yielded me tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2020

THE COUNTRY'S ECONOMIC FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it's a privilege to join my colleagues on the floor this evening to talk about the future of our economy and the new direction that we, the Democrats, are moving this country since taking over the Congress. We will plan to spend the next 45 minutes to an hour talking about where we've been and where we are at this point and the opportunities that we have to continue to go. My colleagues and I will talk about the progress that we've made and the efforts that we've employed to try to create jobs and turn the economy around.

We feel really excited about the accomplishments that we've made thus far. We have only to look back to the month before President Obama took office in January of 2009 to see at that point the economy having bled 700,000-plus jobs. Fast-forward to June, now July of 2010, and we are now adding, on average, between 125,000 and 200,000 jobs per month. And those are private sector jobs. We also have the addition of public-sector jobs through the census. But consistently month after month, particularly starting at the beginning of this year, the economy has consistently added private sector jobs, and that is incredibly important. We know that the way we're going to continue to turn our economy around, the key to our economic revival, is through job creation.

We can attribute much of the success and much of the turnaround that has occurred thus far to our passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act last February. We know that the \$787 billion stimulus package that we passed injected badly needed resources into the economy. But, Madam Speaker, it also injected badly needed capital in the form of tax cuts for the middle class and for working families, and that's something that doesn't get talked about enough.

We do talk a whole lot about job creation, but one of the keys to job creation, we know, is stimulating the economy through tax cuts targeted towards the middle class, working families, and small businesses. We have really endeavored to make sure that

we've struck a careful balance and the right balance between stimulating the economy by injecting the badly needed resources and also generating the tax cuts that we know are the lifeblood of so many small businesses, for them to have the capital available to be able to make the investments that they need in the infrastructure of their businesses so that they can have the wherewithal to add new hires and create more jobs.

And that's something that, if you compare and contrast the priorities of the previous administration to the priorities of the Obama administration and our leadership under Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership here in the House of Representatives, the priorities back in the Bush era were, again, a return to the trickle-down theory of economics; that if you focus tax cuts and if you focus all of your attention on the wealthiest Americans, on the largest corporations, then somehow that largess will flow downward through the economy and, you know, "rising tides lift all boats." Except in this case, we know that that policy sunk the boats and, instead, we capsized a whole lot of small businesses in the water; and now we have been engaged in a really significant effort to try to right those ships and get the economy back on track. We're excited about the progress that we've made, but we also recognize that we have a long way to go.

There are a number of things that we are going to want to focus on tonight. Let's just look at the weekly economic update just in the last week and in the last month. If you look at employment, the private sector in the month of June created an additional 83,000 jobs, and the unemployment rate continues to fall. It fell to 9.5 percent. That's the sixth straight month of job growth in the private sector, and the fall in total unemployment reflected a decrease in our temporary census jobs. We added 9,000 manufacturing jobs in June, and that is the 11th month in a row that we have added manufacturing jobs.

So the progress that we're making is evident. We need to be able to continue that progress and not get too timid or gun-shy while we balance our priorities and make sure that we can focus on getting the jobs done.

The June jobs report was another reminder of just how far we've come since last year and how much work remains to be done to stop the free fall. The President and Congress took strong and immediate steps in the Recovery Act and put those people back to work after 22 straight months of job loss before President Obama took office. We now have seen our economy create private sector jobs for the last 6 months in a row, and we need to make sure that we can continue that recovery.

We're moving in the right direction. We know it's not fast enough, but that's why President Obama is fighting for additional steps to speed up the re-

covery and keep the economy growing. And he and we have made clear that creating jobs is our top priority.

Another priority, for example, in a State like mine, in my home State of Florida, particularly in south Florida, is making sure that we can get lending kick-started again and make sure that folks who are struggling to be able to make their mortgage payments and remain in their homes still have the ability to do that. We have been very focused, and the administration has been very focused on creating programs that will help keep people in their homes, that will give banks and banking institutions the opportunity to work with homeowners so that we don't see masses of individuals out on the street and continue the flood of housing that has become available on the market as a result. So we have a lot of things to think about.

I am joined tonight by several of my colleagues, the first of which is my colleague from Houston, Texas, who has been a long-time Member, focuses on the needs of her district like a laser beam, and has talked quite a bit about the need for job growth. She is struggling in her community, as a fellow Gulf Coast Stater, dealing with the aftermath of the BP oil spill, my good friend, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I am very glad to join multiple friends from a number of our great States in America. But more importantly, I am glad to be part of the team, working with the Congresswoman, our leadership, of course, and the President that focuses on creating jobs for Americans. That's an exciting message for all of us.

And I am very delighted to sort of dash the misstatements that have been going on about what we have accomplished here, and if I might just be redundant and cite the fact that the private sector has created 83,000 jobs in June.

But I would like to add something else, Congresswoman. I think you have seen this number as well, that this has been one of the best quarters for corporations in terms of profits. It is well known, and of course many of us encourage individuals to save money and to invest. But I think it's particularly important for the American public to know that our corporations have money. We've created the right economic atmosphere for them to grow, but they've decided to not create all of the jobs they could. And I would just like this evening to congratulate them for the profits that they've made, but I want them to be inspired to create jobs for the American people because the government has worked very hard to create a banking system for them to feel comfortable with as we pass the Wall Street reform so that they can create jobs, hire people.

There were 9,000 manufacturing jobs created in June, and I think that is extremely important, but 136,000 jobs since December. We have good news for

the American public. We have heard you, and we believe in buying America and making it in America. Therefore, we're going to be looking, over the next couple of months, to craft an agenda where you will see jobs being created by the message of this Democratic leadership.

We can tell you that we mean business because we can show you the facts. For the 11th consecutive month, the manufacturing sector has expanded. They have heard our call. They have heard our creed.

The Purchasing Managers Index registered at 56.2 in June. Of the 18 industries surveyed, 13 reported growth.

Look at, if you will, the gigantic change that we have seen in the automobile manufacturing sector where our companies are coming back. Many people complain about the approach we utilize, but we can look at the bottom line. Ford never took the money. GM has paid the money back. But what we want them to do is to manufacture smartly, hire people and create jobs. We have created—this Democratic leadership, this President has created the atmosphere for these companies to grow, and we want them to grow more.

Let me just add these one or two points. Consumers who have been feeling the pinch—we know there's unemployment, and right now, today, we're fighting to extend unemployment for those hardworking Americans who have seen their jobs go but need to support their families.

□ 2030

And let me make it very clear. Unemployment insurance is not a hand-out. It is a gift coming back, or it is an acknowledgment of your hard work, and we want to keep you over a bridge. We want to give you a bridge until you get another job.

But disposable personal income grew by 0.5 percent in May. It grew by .6 percent in April, and it grew by .4 percent in May. So you can see that it's steadily going up. It's steadily going up, and this is making a difference.

As I cite these last points, Congresswoman, to emphasize how we, on this side of the aisle, the Democrats, have a positive attitude about knowing that America's going to make it as we make products and as manufacturing grows, I'm disappointed that some of my friends who are on the other side of the aisle are thinking differently.

One of the things that they don't like to say is that when President Obama first came into office he inherited an economy that was losing an average of 750,000 jobs in 1 month. Now, I'm not the kind of personality that wants to look back and blame the last administration. But we know for a fact that there were no jobs created in the last 8 years.

And so let me conclude on remarks that have been made by a good friend. The minority whip asked the question, stimulus dollars have not produced jobs. This is what the minority whip

said while hosting a job fair in Virginia. And I would only like to say that to help the American people, it would be grand for us to work and march in step, in a bipartisan step, and that is the only thing we're concerned about, no matter what region we come from, is creating jobs.

Many of you know that we are being hit in the Gulf in many different ways by the BP oil spill. My good friend is being hit for tourism. I just had one of her mayors before my committee, and they said they're not being listened to about tourism.

I'm being hit because of fishermen and shrimpers and oysters, but also I'm being hit by the hardworking people who work in the energy industry who are innocent who may be losing jobs who cannot work offshore.

But our good friend, Mr. CANTOR, rather than working together to produce jobs, has said this: He hasn't seen any evidence of jobs being created.

Well, according to the Council of Economic Advisers, the Recovery Act created or saved more than 48,000 jobs in Virginia in 2009. In May, the Congressional Budget Office reported that in the first quarter of 2010 the Recovery Act was responsible for an increase in the number of people employed by 1.2 million, and 2.8 million. This is stunning.

And the job fair that Mr. CANTOR had, and I congratulate him for having a job fair. I congratulate the companies for coming, and I'm very glad that the companies that were in the room had gotten \$52 million in Recovery Act funds to create jobs.

Can you imagine?

This is not a partisan commitment to America. Wherever you are and you need a job, our stimulus dollars have been there.

And so I hope that we can end our criticism of the Recovery Act, because we know we can point out infrastructure projects and jobs created in all of our home districts, and we can point to the Democratic leadership where their message is jobs, jobs, jobs.

We have nothing to be ashamed of, but we must stay steady. We must stay consistent. We must make sure that the unemployment insurance goes out to our constituents. We're going to fight to the end to make sure that that goes where it needs to go, and that is to the people who need it.

And finally, I'm excited about the manufacturing spurt, surge that we're going to continue when we take the message of buy America and make it in America, we are creating jobs. And this Democratic leadership believes that America is standing tall, and we will be a country that recovers in a very, very special way.

And I'm delighted to be able to join with my friends who understand that there is an American economic recovery. We know it, we see it, and we're working on it.

I yield back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much. Thank you, Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you for joining us and for your leadership. You have really been a stalwart fighter for the middle class and working families that Democrats have always stood for and stood by, and it's just absolutely critical that you've come down here tonight to help us get that message out. So thank you so much.

And it's a really wonderful transition, the item that Ms. JACKSON LEE closed on, making sure that we can make things again. And focusing on manufacturing and the resurgence of manufacturing in this country is a perfect segue to the priorities and the message that I know my good friend from Michigan, whose district I was just in this morning and had the privilege of joining him in his district in Ann Arbor and had an opportunity to meet with his constituents who are very supportive of his efforts to create jobs here and to focus the needs on Michigan's economy right here in Washington. So my good friend, MARK SCHAUER from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. SCHAUER. Thank you, Congresswoman. I'm proud to be here tonight to talk about our recovery, our economic recovery, about jobs, about a manufacturing agenda, and a "made it in America" agenda.

The people that I represent in Michigan understand that we have a fundamental problem with our economic recovery, and that is unfair trade policies that have cost us in Michigan hundreds of thousands of jobs.

I've cosponsored a bill to repeal NAFTA. I know there are different views on that. My views are very clear, that we need to support trade policies that put American jobs and American workers first.

The people at home that I represent have heard me say it, and I'm proud to say it on the floor of the House of Representatives here today. The time is now to fight for American jobs. The time is now to fight for American jobs.

There's an issue that I'm working on that I think I've gotten some attention of certainly Democratic leadership that wants to fight for American jobs and manufacturing and American workers, and I think this is an issue where my friends on the other side of the aisle will embrace as well. I've already got one Republican cosponsor on H.R. 5312. And it's a very simple issue. It's about fairness. It's about fair trade rather than trade policies that, again, have cost us millions of jobs in this country.

What I learned as I've been fighting for fair trade and giving our businesses, small businesses and large, an opportunity to make things again in my State and in this country, is that we have been using our tax dollars to support and create jobs in China rather than jobs here in the United States of America. As I dug into this issue, quite innocently, I was looking through

some census promotional materials, and I was shocked to find that some of those materials to promote something that I support 110 percent, the United States Census, each of our communities needs to get its fair share of dollars to support education and housing and public safety, and so forth, but some of these promotional materials, you guessed it, were made in China.

This is a key ring that—I carry this everywhere I go. And I show small businesses, tool and die shops, small manufacturers, they tell me that they could tool this little key chain, and it says, United States Census 2010. They could have the tooling done, they could have their manufacturing process ready in 1 week to make this little metal key chain.

Now, what you may not be able to see at home, you may not be able to read where it says United States Census. And again, I want to remind you that your tax dollars are paying for this. There's a little sticker, and you guessed it, it says "made in China."

Now, we can and we should make this with our tax dollars here. Now, China, when they joined the World Trade Organization in 2001, did not sign the government—

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would the gentleman yield for a question on the key chain?

Mr. SCHAUER. I will yield.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Have you had an opportunity to talk with the Census Bureau about why it is that they are getting promotional material that they're using to get Americans to complete the census form from China?

Mr. SCHAUER. I have. Thank you for asking me that. I've heard a couple of interesting answers.

□ 2040

And I also have a hat. The people that I represent at home see me with this hat. It's white, a very poor quality hat that says "United States Census 2010," you guessed it, made in China. And the United States Census says, well, if products are substantially altered, substantially altered—this sounds like bureaucratic speak—can qualify as made in America.

So I guess what they consider substantially altered is this little metal key chain that was made in China, apparently had the "United States Census 2010" printing done in the U.S., and that's substantially altered. The hat that I usually have with me—I don't have it tonight—same thing: the hat is made in China.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman would yield for another question. So essentially the screen printing that was done onto the item, they define that as substantially altering the actual piece.

Mr. SCHAUER. Correct.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So it's exempted?

Mr. SCHAUER. It satisfies the Buy American provision. I actually met with Commerce Secretary Gary Locke

about this—and by the way, I have been appointed to the President's Export Council, and I plan to work on these American jobs issues—is if there are certain orders that have to be done quickly, that there is a loophole.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Okay, but can I ask you another question?

Mr. SCHAUER. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Because it's not like we don't know that we do the census every 10 years and that we are going to need promotional materials to promote the census.

Mr. SCHAUER. Exactly.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So what would be the urgent nature or last-minute ordering that would be done for key chains or hats? We know in 2020 we are going to need that. We know in 2030 we are going to need that.

Mr. SCHAUER. Exactly right. Exactly right.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Stock up.

Mr. SCHAUER. The point is there is no good answer. And so we as Democrats have to look at—we have to scour the law, all of our laws, and look at Buy American provisions and make sure there are no loopholes like these that allow our tax dollars to create jobs in other countries. It's not just China. There are T-shirts, I think it was, made in Honduras and so forth.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Would the gentleman yield just for a quick comment? That very product, T-shirts, hats, and there may be many others, just fits right in with small- and medium-sized businesses, the very businesses that make jobs. I would yield to the gentleman for a response on that. Isn't this the kind of products that fit right into that?

Mr. SCHAUER. I was in Reading, Michigan, at a small business appreciation dinner. And I took the hat, took the key chain, and I said, Can anyone here make these? Hands went up. I mean, we can make these things. We do. And, in fact, when I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on this issue, Congressman SANDY LEVIN held a hearing on our trading relationship with China. And the other thing that the Census Bureau says is, well, we don't make these things here, or we don't put them out—you know, we can't find folks here in the United States that make these.

I took seven or eight hats from my office representing different groups in my district. One was from Grand Ledge High School, their baseball team cap. They were all made in America. And of course those items were of a much better quality than the hat that was made in China.

My ultimate point is that China has been playing us for fools. China has been playing us for fools. They are eating our lunch. We are letting them do it. And so it's time for us collectively as Democrats, and I hope our Republican colleagues join us in this fight, it's time to fight for our jobs. This is a simple matter of fairness.

I will sum up this issue that what my bill does, it's a straight issue of reciprocity, a true fair trade issue. And the way it works is that we will allow Chinese companies the same access to our government contracts as China's government is allowing our companies to have access to their government contracts. So if that number in China is zero, then you guessed it, no Chinese company will have access to our government contracts. If the number is a million, then there will be straight reciprocity. So it's time for us to decide which jobs we are going to use our tax dollars to support. And I think the answer for us as Democrats is those jobs are American jobs.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absolutely. And thank you so much for your leadership on this, Congressman SCHAUER. Really, this is something that you have been spearheading for a long time. And it's finally cracking through. I know that it's a priority that we're going to be taking up in the very near future. And I have a hunch that legislation is going to definitely be sent over to the Senate. And they would be hard pressed not to take it up.

With that, I want to turn it over to the very eloquent and hardworking stalwart for creating jobs and helping us turn the economy around in his home State of New York, Mr. PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and thank you for bringing us together to discuss an important aspect of the work we do, creating jobs, providing the dignity of work for individuals and families across this great country. And it's great to join with you and Representative JACKSON LEE, Representative SCHAUER. I know we are going to be hearing from Representative MURPHY.

But to be with everyone here and put our thoughts into a context that allows people to understand where we are headed with this recovery program, I think this chart expresses it in a very straightforward, simplistic way, a simple straightforward decline for many months, where we lost \$17.5 trillion of household income, where 8.2 million jobs were lost. We were headed for a deep, deep depression. And then this sharp straight line upward, which now expresses a recovery.

And I should point out that many of us believe, all of us here on this floor tonight believe, that we're not only recovering the economy, but we're restructuring the economy. That's an important aspect of the work we're doing. To create those jobs that will bring strength to the American worker, provide economic vitality for the American family. And so we see this clustering here of 6 months of recovery in the private sector area of job creation and job retention.

This is an important aspect to the investment that has been made, the policy reforms that have been initiated and responded to by this administra-

tion and the leadership of this House. But there is more to come. We're not satisfied with this.

But when we hear the critics from the other side of the aisle say where's that great number of jobs, where are those new jobs, well, we can point to these new jobs. They're there. They're a statistic. They're historic now. Where were you to decry the loss of those jobs? There was silence about the jobs being lost. There's huge contrast in their approach to the jobs. We heard nothing with job loss. Now we're hearing complaints, diminishing, of the efforts to create jobs, especially in the private sector, which is happening.

I think rather than dwell on statistics, and all of my colleagues have done this very well tonight about statistically showing that we're making progress and that we've turned the corner and that there's been a sharp U-turn in the response as a Nation for job creation, but I think we need to put it in the big-picture framework of trust, of competence.

This party, the Democrats, have come forward with a plan of action, one that has saved a lot of effort of further loss, economic consequences for American families. And we know who brought us that steep red line of decline: it was a party that continues to espouse privatization of Social Security, vouchering of Medicare, supporting tax breaks to ship jobs offshore, to call the response to Wall Street reform akin to attacking an ant with an atom bomb.

What a gross misrepresentation. What a gross unawareness of the issues that brought this country's economy to its knees. And so I bring forth that sort of contrast because I think it's what's governing the response today. The positives, the optimism that we share, the reforms we're promoting are swinging us upward. The contrast is that continued effort to further push hard on the middle class, to not allow for Medicare—a system that has worked well for our Nation's seniors—to raise the age limit, the threshold for Social Security. All of these efforts coming, all of this denouncement of Social Security, of Medicare, that has stabilized people in their retirement years, are what they advance and what they promote.

□ 2050

Are you going to trust that thinking, that party, to continually pull us into the red, or are you going to look at Democratic action where we've resisted this sort of behavior, where we are believing we can grow the economy, where we are embracing the theme that we are going to make it in America again? Let American workers know that we're standing for that turnaround.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TONKO. I most certainly will.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. Because I wanted to ask you, the

way you're characterizing our colleagues' view—and I want to bring our good friend, Mr. MURPHY, into this discussion because he and I, in the 2006 to 2008, in the 110th Congress, we spent quite a bit of time on the House floor talking about the Republicans' efforts to privatize Social Security. And I'm wondering if your characterization of their agenda is one that you—is this something that you think is—is it your opinion?

From what I understand, we have a number of different third party validators that can document that they have consistently supported privatization of Social Security and vouching of the Medicare system as we know it.

Mr. TONKO. Oh, absolutely. As stated on the floor, we know what people want. We know where they want to take us. And I just think the contrast needs to be shared, because that same thinking is prevalent in terms of economic recovery, of economic development policies, of the sort of stopping of the bleeding that we promoted here in the House by inserting a new order of thinking.

You know, even with the energy crisis, with the devastation—Representative JACKSON LEE, you see it from where you sit, and Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, you see it from the Florida perspective, Texas perspective—the gulf has been impacted. And for people from the cheap energy voice in this House, coming from the Energy and Commerce Committee, required an apology, demanded an apology from the President for coming down hard on BP. And all of the devastation to the economy, to the people, 11 lives lost, the ecosystem being devastated. That's another sign of difference where there isn't trust, in my opinion, or confidence.

So people, I think, are going to take a look at this and say, Let's continue this. The path out of the damaged zone may not be as quick as we would have liked, but it is happening. It is happening in a positive measurement and its growth in the private sector of job creation for 6 continuous months.

So I just think that contrast is important in the discussion that we have here tonight on the floor of the House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. TONKO. Really, you have hammered home, you're here night after night, week after week, to make sure that we can talk to the American people, illuminate not just our efforts on turning the economy around and creating jobs but our successes.

And someone who has been really focused on creating jobs, making sure, as a member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, making sure that we do that through our innovation agenda, through our passage of the global warming and climate change legislation and also through health care reform, is the leader from the great State of Connecticut, Congressman CHRIS MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Representative TONKO, Representative JACKSON LEE.

Listen, everybody should take a look at that chart that was next to Representative TONKO. It's not a coincidence that from month to month to month in the last year of the Bush administration we lost more and more and more jobs, and then immediately upon the new President, President Obama, taking office, we started to lose less and less and less jobs to the point now where we are adding jobs to the economy. It's because the stimulus has worked. It is because it is infusing new money into the economy. It is because tax rates are the lowest in this country since 1950. People have more money to spend than ever before. It's because we put money in the hands of teachers and firefighters and police officers and renewable energy companies and solar companies and advanced battery technology companies. The leading edge of our economy is creating jobs. It's because manufacturing is coming back.

To Mr. SCHAUER's point in June, 9,000 new manufacturing jobs in this economy. Since December, 136,000 new manufacturing jobs. The economy is heading in the right direction because we're putting new policies into place that are investing in small manufacturers, in small businesses, in Main Street.

And that's the dichotomy here. I mean, that's why I ran for Congress 4 years ago, because I watched Washington, I watched the Bush administration put all of its focus on the haves, on the big multinational companies, on the big oil companies, the big pharmaceutical companies, the big defense contractors, and very little emphasis on the small manufacturer with 10 employees around the corner from me; very little emphasis on the small mom-and-pop business that was struggling to get by paying for the energy costs and the health care costs that were padding the pockets of the big guys. That's the fundamental shift that's happened here, and you see it on issue after issue.

You see it in our approach to energy as, Mr. TONKO, you said we're investing in small renewable energy companies while the Republican leadership, on issues of energy, are asking for apologies to BP. You see it on health care reform, where we're putting power in the hands of consumers; whereas, the Republicans, when they tried their stab at health care reform with the Medicare Prescription Drug Act, put all the power in the hands of insurance companies and drug companies. And you see it with respect to manufacturing.

What we're talking about as Democrats is reinvigorating American manufacturing, to stop this defeatist notion that we can't make things here in America anymore. That's what sort of drove the House of Representatives when the Republicans were in charge was manufacturing is dead. They can't

do it here any longer; we're just going to sign free trade agreements with any country that comes to us without any regard to fair trade, that we're going to allow jobs to flow out to China, to India, to Mexico.

Democrats and the Obama administration refuse to give in to that notion. And I think you are going to see, over the course of the next several weeks and several months on this House floor, Democrats in the House of Representatives standing up for American manufacturing and saying we can make it here in the United States.

Mr. SCHAUER's initiative is right on, right on. If we can start standing up to countries like China and say, Listen, if you're going to—if you want free trade with the United States, then you have to allow us to sell to you just like you sell to us. I think it starts with the way that we buy things for the American Government.

A number of us are working on legislation that we hope will come before the floor very shortly that will say simply this: When the American Government buys things, whether it be for the census or whether it be for the Defense Department, let's buy it here in the United States.

Sure, you might be able to find that part for the jet engine 10 percent cheaper in China, but that job being created in China rather than in a machine shop in New York or Connecticut is costing our government, is costing our economy way more than the 10 percent you saved in lost wages, in lost taxes, and in increased social safety net costs like unemployment compensation.

So I'm looking forward to this summer and this fall as we build on the work that we've done here, when Democrats do what we're good at doing, which is standing up for small guys, for little guys, for American manufacturing, and that we put an end to what has been a decade-long defeatist attitude in this country and in this government to just allow for manufacturing to go to the folks that can do it for the cheapest and who can do it with the lowest and the worst environmental and labor regulations around.

I think we're going to stand up for American manufacturing. I think we're going to continue this trend of growing manufacturing jobs. I think it's going to be part, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, of the story of the recovery and the resurgence of the American economy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you very much for helping us share that story with the American people and with our constituents, because it's absolutely critical, as we turn the corner and go through the summer, that we make sure that we talk about our efforts to continue to focus on job creation, and particularly on tax cuts for working families and the middle class because it's such a dramatic shift from where we were. And as we get closer and closer to the choice that Americans will be making in November, it's

going to be critical that people understand the choice that they're going to be making. They can backslide toward the Bush era, where the focus was exclusively on the wealthiest few in America, exclusively on the largest corporations and the trickle-down theory of economics that was disproven time and again, or we can continue to go in the direction, the new direction that we have been pursuing, which is focusing on job creation, focusing on making sure that the middle class can thrive.

And there is no one that knows that effort better than my good friend TOM PERRIELLO from the great State of Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you so much for bringing this group together to talk about jobs.

As the gentleman from Connecticut mentioned, we can build things, make things, and grow things better than anyone else in the world if we give the American people a chance. For too many years, the other side has had a strategy of saying if we just nickel-and-dime the middle class enough, maybe we can win a race to the bottom with China. If we just cut into our environment enough, maybe we can win a race to the bottom with China. That's been the Republican strategy. We will not win a race to the bottom with China.

Our side wants to win a race to the top with China. We can outcompete China and India as well as Europe and Japan if we unleash the innovation, entrepreneurship of the American people that comes from our small businesses, if we understand that instead of bailing out the biggest companies for their failures we start to give just a little bit of support to our small business owners, our entrepreneurs, our scientists, our innovators.

□ 2100

We made a down payment last year on rebuilding America's competitive advantage. We made a down payment to unleash the research and development, the technology and the innovation in our small businesses. And we also understand that to win that race to the top against China, we have to have a 21st century workforce, so we have made college a little more affordable.

But it is not just kids headed to college. We also want to invest in those who want to learn a trade or career in technical training. That can be the difference between making minimum wage and 20 bucks an hour. Sometimes in this city or on Wall Street the difference between minimum wage and 20 bucks an hour doesn't seem like a whole lot, but to people back home it is the difference between being able to support your family or not, being able to pay those bills or not.

And we have tried to go after those who are nickle and diming the working class and the middle class in this country, the utilities, the credit card com-

panies, the health insurance companies and others that have been bankrupting our small business owners and our working class and middle-class folks.

We can still build it here. We are already seeing this in the energy sector. As many of the people here tonight have talked about, our farmers can be on the front line of that struggle for America's energy independence. Our manufacturing in our district is actually exporting to Asia on high quality efficiency technologies.

But it is not going to happen by pulling in our shell. It is not going to happen by thinking small. It is not going to happen by doubting the resolve of the American spirit, the American individual, the American entrepreneur. It is going to be doing it by giving that support.

Right now we can be doing more to rebuild this Nation's infrastructure; the infrastructure of yesterday, our sewage, our water, our roads; and of tomorrow, our broadband technology, our electric grid technology, so that we have the most efficient system. That is how we outcompete the world. We can still do this better than anyone else. We must call all of us to that best self right now to outcompete, and we are not going to do it by taking our foot off the pedal right now.

We are in tough economic times. Our American families feel it. Just this last week I did a tour of over a dozen Main Streets in my district in central and southern Virginia, talking to small business owners who spent a lifetime building up their business, their clientele, their reputation, to one day sell that business in order to be able to retire securely.

Times are tough. That is not where we live right now in terms of Main Street. But we have to start putting Main Street ahead of Wall Street, and I mean the kind of values we have on Main Street, of basic decency and accountability. That is what we need in terms of real Wall Street reform. That is what we mean in terms of transparency, like the DISCLOSE Act.

Where I come from, if you want to say something, you stand by it. You put your name by it. That is the simple rule of the DISCLOSE Act. To Wall Street, we are just saying if you don't have the money, you shouldn't be able to lend out the money. I think we need to do more to put a hard cap on these leverage restrictions. And I mean Main Street jobs, and thinking we still need those jobs for people that they can support a family with.

The people here tonight are dedicated to that working and middle-class American who has been struggling in these tough economic times, to make it a little easier to get that business started, a little easier to get through the tough times, a little easier to get that child off to college or to trade school, and a little easier to make sure that you are going to have a secure retirement.

I look forward to this month, because we are in an urgent time. This is not a

time for political games by either side. This is a time where we shouldn't leave until we have launched a manufacturing strategy and an agricultural strategy for the 21st century, where we have helped to put our construction crews back to work making this country more efficient.

We can do these things, I have no doubt that we can, and I believe that we will continue to fight the people here to make sure that that happens and that we will see that economic growth and recovery back on Main Street.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. PERRIELLO, and thank you for your leadership in your district and the optimism and hope that you fight for every single day.

You know, it really always boggles my mind how the Republicans wake up every morning, come to work and decide, I am going to be an obstructionist today. I think today I am going to figure out yet another way to say no. And rather than come to the table and work with us, because they need jobs in their districts too, instead, they vote no here, and then they do like the minority whip did just in the last week when he was home in his district. After voting no on the Recovery Act and being critical of the Recovery Act, he didn't have any problem showing up and taking credit for one of the projects funded by the Recovery Act in his district. I think Americans really see through that transparent attempt at hypocrisy.

We are a party of genuine articles. We are Members who work hard every day to make sure that we can get it done for the American people and get this economy turned around.

There is no one that works harder at that in rural America than my good friend LINCOLN DAVIS from the great State of Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Debbie, it is certainly good to be here. And as I have listened to the debate, the discussions that we have had about creating jobs in America, I think personally to go back and check a little bit of history. I represent a unique congressional district, but so do 434 other Members of the U.S. House. The district I represent is the fourth most rural residential congressional district in this country. It has the third highest number of blue collar workers.

We are hurting in the Fourth Congressional District, as we are throughout America. And what we have been seeing in the last several years is an administration and those who truly do not understand, not only rural America, but those who live in urban and inner-city as well.

As an example, starting on January 1st, 2008, through October 31st, 2009, we lost eight million jobs in this country, eight million moms and dads, eight million working sons and daughters who lost their jobs starting in January. I am not talking about 2007, I am talking about just in that 22-month period alone, eight million jobs. During the

Bush administration, around one million jobs were created, new jobs in the time January 1st of 2001 through the time that George Bush left office on January 20th of 2009.

If you take that growth number during that period of 8 years and look how long it would take us to find the jobs to replace the eight million that were lost, it would take 64 years at the same growth rate during the Bush administration.

So for the folks on the other side of the aisle, start using math. When you use the math, be sure it adds up to what you are saying.

When we look at eight million jobs that we have lost starting in January, the last 13 months of the Bush administration, through October 31st of 2009, if we were to create 200,000 jobs a month—during the Clinton administration—that is what happened, about 250,000 on the average jobs per month during the 8 years that Clinton was President. But if we take those numbers, it will take over 3 years to just replace the eight million jobs we lost as a result of the trade policies and the policies of the Bush administration.

So if we want to start analyzing and blaming folks, let's get the facts straight. Let's get the figures right. People in my district don't care who it is, whether it is Bush or whether it is the Obama administration, whether it is the Clinton administration. They want jobs.

How will we create those? Through the eighties, in the area I represent, the apparel industry and the textile industry was a great part of the low wages, quite frankly, and some of the low-skilled jobs that we had.

My brother worked at a garment factory that worked almost 1,500 people in 1983. As a result of the trade deals that we cut with the Caribbean steel initiative and the Andean region, as the result of the tax policy that we had, we reduced taxes on the richest people in America from 70 percent, as it was on January 1, 1981, to 28 percent was the max.

I am not complaining because we had a tax cut, but here is what I do disagree with. We also during that period of time told small business folks, I am sorry, the depreciation schedules you had, 10 to 15 years, are no longer in place. It is going to take you 30-plus years now. So in essence what we told small business folks, you no longer have the tax breaks that you had at one time. You no longer have the tax incentives to create jobs for folks who live in rural America and inner-city or urban areas, because what we are doing is giving the tax breaks to the wealthiest individual wage earners, not small business folks.

When the other side talks about helping small business engage, let's really get serious about a tax policy through depreciation schedules that will encourage small business folks, the creator of 70 percent of the jobs in our country, an opportunity to start revitalizing America again.

In 1970, one out of four people worked in manufacturing in this country. Today it is one in 10. Let me repeat that. One out of four people worked in manufacturing. One in 10 does today. Where are those jobs?

In 1998, we signed an agreement, this country did, and I have to blame the Clinton administration and perhaps Mr. Rubin, who was the Treasurer at that time, we signed trade deals called GATT, General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, and we brought two large countries, India and China, which has a third of the world's population, into the WTO.

□ 2110

In 1998, you could not find an American label in China. It's hard to find an American label in America today. They're all over there. And when you purchase an item today that has always had an American label on it, whether it's toys, whether it's clothing, or whatever it may be, that American label is still stamped on it to look where it's made. It was made here at one time in this country. So from my standpoint, we've got to revisit many things that have caused us to lose 8 million jobs in 22 months. And if we don't do something about it, we'll never be able to regain those. We'll continue to see our economy and America slide backward when it comes to industrial development and economic growth.

I propose—and I hope that we can possibly take a serious look at a bipartisan effort to revisit the trade deals—the free trade deals—and make them reciprocal trade deals. Reciprocity means each of us shares equally. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. From this standpoint, when we also gave fast track to the former President to actually make the deals and send them to Congress, where we can't change those deals, it hamstrung the advocates for America, the direct representatives for America. The U.S. House of Representatives was denied an opportunity to amend any trade agreement.

So as we engage in trade in the future—and my time is running short—we need to realize 8 million jobs, 200,000 jobs created a month more than what we had starting the first of the month. It will take us almost 3 years to recover the jobs we lost in the last budget year with the Bush administration. I don't really like to be partisan, but I hear so much rhetoric from the other side. No one is pointing out the facts. It's time for the facts, and it's time the American people start listening to the facts rather than listening to bumper sticker slogans.

It's America, folks. It's our country, folks. It's not about Democratic or Republican politics. It's not about ideologies. An ideologue looks for the future. It's reality today. And the future will be reality when it appears. The ideologues will never have it where they want it—on the left or the right.

It's time we start worrying about America again and creating jobs for all of us in this Nation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. DAVIS. Really, I think it's so incredible. We had nine Members join us tonight for this hour. And we had the full philosophical spectrum—from the most conservative member of our caucus to the moderates to progressive members of our caucus. And that shows not only the big tent that we are in the Democratic Caucus but that we really are a reflection of America and American values, whether it's making sure that we can create jobs in rural America or the most urban core. It's absolutely critical.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Would you yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes. Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I notice there's a chart up showing the huge deficits. When Barack Obama was elected President, the first 30 days of his term he had to renew a trillion dollars and pay the interest on it. If JOHN MCCAIN had been elected, he would have had to renew a trillion dollars that he didn't bring to the table. Whoever was elected President and sworn in on January 20 in 2009, the next 30 days we had \$12 trillion in total national debt. You look at that on a monthly basis, that's a trillion a month we have to renew and pay the interest on it. It didn't matter who it was. So as we look at the national debt, please, America, yeah, we need to reduce the deficit. And we're working on that. We call that pay-as-you-go. We need performance-based programming in our budget.

And so I would just want to remind you: 8 million jobs lost, starting on January 1, 2008, America, and the current President, regardless of who it is—Barack Obama or if it had been JOHN MCCAIN—had \$1 trillion every month since they'd been President to renew and pay the interest on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You're absolutely right. Thank you so much for your leadership and for joining us this evening.

To close us out in the hour, we have a duo from the great State of Pennsylvania. Both of them are freshmen. The gentlelady from Pennsylvania was particularly pleased, I know, when her colleague from Pennsylvania was elected recently in a special election because that made her not one of the most junior Members in the Chamber. Now he holds that title. But the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, Mrs. KATHY DAHLKEMPER.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Thank you so much. I appreciate the gentlewoman from Florida's leadership here. I want to reiterate my good friend from Tennessee brought up some of the important numbers that need be brought up. I'm from western Pennsylvania, as is my fellow colleague who has now made me not the junior Member. We have a manufacturing-based economy. And the numbers that my friend from Tennessee talked about are the numbers

that I have seen not in the past 2 years but over the last 12 or 15 years in terms of good manufacturing jobs lost in our region.

And what I find most exciting about this recovery that we are in is that we are making things again. And it's already been talked about tonight. But we are making things in America again. For the 11th consecutive month, the manufacturing sector has expanded in this country. We have got to depend on making things for our economic growth, not on the paper industry of Wall Street. And we have seen the problems with that, starting in 2007 and beyond.

I want to bring up a few highlights from an article from the Erie Daily Times today, an article that talked about Erie County, where my home is from: manufacturing employment rose in May for the third month in a row. Viking Plastic in Erie County had increased employment from a low of 65 workers to nearly 100. GE Transportation, which reduced payroll by 1,500 workers in 2009, has called back 200 permanent and temporary workers.

Economic growth is being seen throughout my district in the manufacturing sector. I visited a small electronics manufacturer, AMS Electronics, in Butler, Pennsylvania. They're performing well, despite the downturn, having increased their client base with the help of their local manufacturing extension partnership, a program that we fund through an act called the America COMPETES Act, which has recently been passed through the House.

So there is good news coming out of western Pennsylvania. Just even yesterday, I was at Donjon Shipping, a new manufacturer. We're building currently a tug boat; working on a barge next. Making things, permanent products that are going to be helping to improve the wealth of our Nation and bring great jobs here.

So I want to just reiterate what so many of my colleagues have said tonight, that there is good news. America is recovering. Not as fast as those out there need us to. Obviously, too many people still unemployed. But when you've lost 8 million jobs, 8 million jobs. We're on track this year to create more jobs than were created under 8 years of the Bush administration. I think that's important to remember.

So we are moving forward. We are creating jobs in this country. I just wanted to tell a little bit about the good news from western Pennsylvania. I want to thank everyone for their help tonight here with bringing this message to the American people—the message that we are continuing to recover. This summer we're going to see what we call the “summer of stimulus,” where we're going to see, I think, great numbers with highway projects that will increase by more than 600 percent from July of 2009 to this July.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Given that you're from a State that is in the heart of the Manufacturing Belt, can you talk a little bit about what is going on in your district and the efforts that we're making here to create jobs and what kind of progress the recent surge in manufacturing has brought to communities in Pennsylvania?

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. One of the great things about my part of Pennsylvania, and I really think Pennsylvania in general—I have to be a bit biased here—but we have a great ethic and we have people with great skills. We have been a manufacturing-based economy for a long time. So when businesses come there and they see the work ethic of the people, they want to stay, expand, and grow. And what we're doing is trying to provide that climate that will allow our businesses to grow and to provide those opportunities maybe for those new entrepreneurs that they have an opportunity to actually take that product that really could do great things in our country and do great things actually throughout the world. Because I see more and more of our businesses actually exporting also, and work that was going to Mexico and to China actually coming back, because we can make anything as well, if not better, than anybody else in the world. And we know that.

So we're working hard. As I mentioned, great numbers coming out of our district because there's new products, there's new clientele, there's expansion and creation going on throughout many different sectors of our manufacturing-based economy. And so whether we're talking about some of the tax credits and incentives we've been trying to do either through the recovery package or with other pieces of legislation, we are working hard to get back to that manufacturing base. At least from my part of the world, my part of the country, it's important. I know not so much in Florida, but in Pennsylvania it certainly is the backbone of our economy, along with agriculture.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, it's okay. You're right. In Florida, we don't have a strong manufacturing base, but we want to make sure that folks in Pennsylvania are able to thrive economically so they can come down and vacation and they can afford to take a vacation and come down to south Florida and across my beautiful home State and spend their hard-earned dollars that they have been able to use and invest in their small business and come down and make sure that they can help our economy thrive.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. We yield back the balance of our time and thank the Speaker for the opportunity and look forward to hearing from our colleagues.

□ 2120

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KOSMAS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, that's one of the great things about our system, we have a chance to speak from both sides. As I listened, I was surprised to hear I had taken so many positions that I had never taken. But let me just say that with regard to Republicans being for privatizing Social Security, that bill did not pass. It didn't even get around here to get passed because so many Republicans were not in favor of it. And, in fact, you can go back and find this Republican saying repeatedly then and still saying that what we should do is what was not done when Social Security came into existence, and that is take Social Security tax dollars and put them in a Social Security account.

Now, until I got here 5½ years ago, I was under the impression that it was some kind of modern creation that Social Security tax dollars were taken away, they never even get to the Social Security Trust Fund but went to general revenue with IOUs being placed in file cabinets for the Social Security Trust Fund. But lo and behold, come to find out, Social Security tax dollars have never, ever gone into the Social Security Trust Fund, not since its inception.

Now, in Texas, we have the Texas Employee Retirement System. Teachers have an employee retirement system. And those systems have done many times better than Social Security for one reason: They put dollars into the retirement fund so the fund was able to grow. And because it was able to grow, people can get several times more in the way of retirement payments from those retirement systems than you can from Social Security. In fact, when I first got here in 2005, I had my staff run a check to find out—and I gave them a hypothetical to submit to Social Security as well as to the Texas Employee Retirement System and another retirement system to find out what kind of monthly income you would receive under that hypothetical.

It turned out, the best Social Security could tell us was that under the hypothetical we gave them, that the monthly income from Social Security to a deserving senior would be somewhere between \$600 and \$900 a month. Well, if anybody is familiar with seniors and the costs that they end up being out of pocket, you will know that \$600 to \$900 does not go far enough, but that's what Social Security payments would be. And as I recall the hypothetical, it was \$30,000 average for 30 years before retirement, and that was the best we could get, \$600 to \$900.

However, when that hypothetical was provided to the Texas Employee Retirement System, which puts real money into an account, it turns out the monthly payment was somewhere between \$2,600 to \$2,800 per month—the same hypothetical—and the difference was that real money went into the trust fund.

But President Franklin Roosevelt knew, apparently, when this began that there would not be real money going into the trust fund, and every President since then has known that. President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama, they've all known. No money that is pried out of the hands of those who earn it and those that pay those who earn it, none of that money goes into the Social Security Trust Fund, not a dime. Now, that's tragic.

I was pushing that back at the time in 2005. And true, there were Republicans who did not support that, and there were lots of Democrats who didn't because, as we've seen since my friends across the aisle have had such a huge majority in recent years, they've done nothing about Social Security tax money going into the Social Security Trust Fund. They control both Houses. They could have passed a bill requiring Social Security tax money to go into the trust fund in January of 2007. Madam Speaker, I can tell you, there would have been a lot of us Republicans voting for that had they decided to bring that to the floor. If it was brought to the floor this week, next week, I would vote for it. Social Security tax money must go into the Social Security Trust Fund.

But there has been a reason that they have not wanted that to go from the general revenue into the Social Security Trust Fund to shore up Social Security, and that's because there are so many other little pet projects and pet ideas that this money goes to fund. I heard my friends across the aisle talking repeatedly about how important infrastructure was. Isn't that ironic, because after President Obama was sworn in, became President, the Democratic Party had such big majorities—a majority here in the House and was veto-proof, or had a supermajority down in the Senate at the time—they didn't do anything about Social Security being shored up. They didn't do anything about infrastructure, not in the way that it was talked about.

We heard so many beautiful, eloquent speeches from friends across the aisle on how this spendulus stimulus bill was going to pay for all of this wonderful infrastructure. America was led to believe that the whole \$787 billion was going to end up being for infrastructure and really be good for America. Well, there was a little bait-and-switch that went on, which is easy to do.

My colleague, for whom I have great respect, I heard saying that Repub-

licans have "hamstrung the deliberative process." So apparently, as best I can figure—I'm sure he's smarter than I am, but the deliberative process then, apparently, must mean that you rush in with a 2,000-page bill not once but repeatedly, say, There's no time for anybody to read this. Too many jobs are being lost every day. There's no time for this to go through committee. There's no time for amendments. There's no time for anything. People are losing their jobs as we speak. You've just got to vote for it now.

Now, see, to me, just from the very practical, pragmatic growing up that I had, a deliberative process would have meant that it had time to be viewed and get some sunshine into those 2,000 pages to figure out where all this pork was going, that that would have been part of the deliberative process.

□ 2130

But apparently, as Republicans, we hamstrung the process that they called deliberative, where you rush in with a 2,000-page bill repeatedly, say there's no time to read it, just pass it and then we'll find out what's in it. See, I wouldn't have thought that was deliberative. But apparently, since my colleague said Republicans hamstrung the deliberative process, that must be what he's talking about.

So they rush in with this \$787 billion stimulus bill. You could have polled Americans after it passed and the majority would have said, you know, this is going to be great for building infrastructure. We need infrastructure. Little did they know that 6, less than 7 percent of the \$787 billion was ever even thought to have anything to do with infrastructure. So that's why I say a bit of a bait and switch there.

America wasn't even sold on it, but the few that were thought that was going to be for infrastructure and that didn't happen. Just such a tiny, tiny bit of it.

We heard our friends during the last hour talk repeatedly about small business and how the stimulus was so good for small business. What they forgot to mention, they may not be aware, but of that \$787 billion, less than 1 percent was for small business. How about that?

So it was all about small business and infrastructure, and yet less than 7 percent was for infrastructure and less than 1 percent geared, aimed at small business. Interesting.

So is it any wonder that, with people thinking that 6, 7 percent of \$787 billion will build all the infrastructure we need and less than 1 percent will help small business more than anybody else, that it hasn't had the desired effect?

And I couldn't really see my colleague's chart well enough to see what the last month was where they were talking about all these private jobs being created.

But forget the charts. Let's look at real numbers. And the real numbers for the month of June came out, and I

don't have a big pretty chart for it, but the fact is that in the month of June there was great news and then there was really bad news. The great news was that for the month of June, 431,000 jobs were created. That is great news. The really bad news is that 411,000 of those were temporary census workers. So much for all those private sector jobs we were hearing about.

I heard my colleagues talk about Republicans just want to nickel and dime the middle class. I've got an awful lot of Republican friends, and I don't remember any Republicans I know of wanting to nickel and dime the middle class. The ones I know of see people in the poorest sector of America, see people in the middle class of America and want them to do even better. But it won't happen when the government is taking over control of everything. You kill incentives.

And I've mentioned this before, but it is just such a clear lesson of what happens when the government gets involved and decides it's going to be the one that creates the jobs.

And it was 1973, as an exchange student for the summer to the Soviet Union, going out to a collective farm, 30 miles or so from Kiev in Ukraine, and farmers sitting in the shade when their fields looked terrible. This is in the middle of summertime. Well, anybody's worked on farms or ranches knows in the middle of the morning is when you want to be working hard because you want to try to get done before the sun gets to its hottest in the afternoon, and so you start when the sun does and you try to finish before it gets to its hottest. And here it was, the best time of the day to be working, and they were all sitting in the shade with no movement toward going to work.

And so I spoke a little Russian back then and asked, when do you work in the field? And they all laughed. And one of them said, I make the same number of rubles if I'm out there or if I'm here in the shade, so I'm here. That's what the government did. It kills incentives when it decides it's going to take over the job market.

And I loved hearing the discussion about big corporations, big pharmaceuticals, big oil. You know, we've heard this Wall Street, they're all the big buddies of the Republicans. And yet, if you go check, Wall Street has traditionally given 4-1 to Democrats over Republicans. That was true for Goldman Sachs. If you don't just look at the officers, but you look at their spouses and their children, then you find a 4-1 average giving to Democrats over Republicans.

And the big pharmaceutical companies that were mentioned, they let greed get the better side of them in coming out in support of the ObamaCare bill. And for the short term they'll make billions, maybe hundreds of billions more than they would have without the bill. But in the long term, they've written their own death warrant. The same with AMA, AHA. They

sold their souls. Short term, they'll come out good. In the long run their professions, as we know it, will be changed forever for the worst for American health care. And we're already seeing those things.

I get out in my district. I've been in other parts of the country. I'm hearing the people say, you know, we've decided not to hire because this crap-and-trade bill may get passed. We've already had this health care monstrosity wrapped around our necks. We're going to have to end up having to pay more than ever.

You know, the President went out there to have a big photo OP with Caterpillar, and then it turns out they were going to lose over a million, was it \$100 million this year?

We know jobs are being lost all over the country because of that health care bill. There was no need to push good jobs out of this country. When I hear my friends say, I couldn't believe they said the Democrats want it manufactured here and Republicans don't. That's ridiculous.

I went with a bipartisan group to China 5 years ago, bipartisan because there were both Republicans and Democrats. And the ones I talked to on both sides of the aisle wanted to see jobs return to America, manufacturing jobs. And I thought that perhaps, as we talked to CEOs, the number one thing I would hear was they left the U.S. and went to China because labor was so much cheaper there. That was not the number one thing I heard.

The number one thing I heard was the corporate taxes in China, 17 percent, U.S. 35 percent, plus States pop them on top of that, and local governments do as well. And so not only that, but China would cut deals with them. No income tax for 5 years, then gradually increase up to 17 percent.

And one of the things I loved hearing was that the quality of the work by American workers was greatly exceeding that that could be done in China by the workers there. That was good to hear. Quality control in the U.S. was so much better.

But that huge 35 to 40 percent hit that they had to take before they competed in the global economy was just too much. It was putting them under. And they could go to China, and with the dramatic cut in corporate tax, they could build state-of-the-art facilities that allowed them to have workers who were not capable of as good a quality control here, and then their state-of-the-art facility would be paid for by the time, many times before the taxes really kicked in in earnest at less than half of what they were in the United States.

□ 2140

So if my friends across the aisle were really serious about bringing manufacturing jobs here, then the solution would be to eliminate the corporate tax. It's one of the most insidious governmental creations in this country.

Insidious because everybody gets to talk about these mean, evil corporations and how we want to sock it to the corporations, when the insidious truth is no matter how much tax you lay onto the corporations, if they don't pass that onto the consumer, they don't stay in business. And that's why so many have left and gone to other countries, one of the biggest reasons why they've left and gone to other countries.

Now, we've heard some are not building here for refineries or energy businesses because of this looming threat of the crap-and-trade bill. Our President in 2008 had commented that he wasn't going to—basically, he said he wasn't going to put coal power plants out of business, but he would skyrocket the cost of energy. And that's where we're headed, and so that will drive businesses out of the U.S.

We've had the moratorium declared by the President that was then struck down as unconstitutional. But this administration did not want to let a little thing like the Constitution get in the way, so this week they've come back with another moratorium, basically throwing the Constitution, the judicial sector, throwing them away because just as they did with the auto task force, no confirmation from the Senate, just appointed people, and they took charge of the automobile business.

They came out with a declaration as to what dealerships would close, which ones would have their property taken without due process of law. They came out with a bankruptcy plan that did not go through the requirements of bankruptcy law. They found a judge—I don't know the judge, but bankruptcy judges have to be confirmed I believe it's every 10 years. It's not a lifetime appointment. Many of them would like to be district judges. So apparently it wasn't hard to find a judge who would sign off on an illegal, unconstitutional auto task force plan, and no accountability to anybody. And once the Congress let it go without stepping in and being the check and balance on illegality and unconstitutionality, then there was only one branch left to stop such unconstitutional, illegal activity, and that was the Supreme Court.

To her wonderful credit, Ruth Bader Ginsburg put a 24-hour hold on it. And apparently the administration improperly scared the Supreme Court into thinking that if they extended the hold any longer than 24 hours, all the automobile industry, all of those related to the auto industry would go under and it would all be on the Supreme Court's head. And supposedly, the Supreme Court would never let such a ridiculous thing, unconstitutional thing go through again, but they let it through then.

And so we know that this administration is capable of doing end runs on the Constitution. And it looks like that's what they're doing again on the moratorium. So with the moratorium being

in place, as one person in Louisiana said, we stand a chance of losing more jobs from the moratorium than we do from the oil spill. And of course beat up on Big Oil. Yet as the Deepwater Horizon rig was exploding and sinking, there were still deals being cut with this administration and this majority's dear friend British Petroleum, because they were one of the few big energy firms that were supportive of the crap-and-trade bill. So they hated to see their good friend get in trouble.

They were hoping it would blow over, they would get control of this disastrous well in the gulf coast. But they didn't, and eventually the administration and majority had to throw them under the bus. Whereas, if they had been able to get control of the oil well, you would have seen a big photo op with the BP executives as they pushed through the crap-and-trade bill. So, hopefully it will not come back and get passed because it will mean so many jobs that will be lost in America.

And you know, I know they meant well, I know the intentions were good across the aisle when we debated that bill here in the House. And so many people came in here and said nobody is going to lose their job as a result of this bill. In fact, we're going to create jobs. It's going to be like Spain. We're going to create so many green jobs. Well, since then we found out Spain has actually lost two jobs for every one green job they have created, and now they are trying to abandon the very thing that this administration and this majority are trying to push us toward.

But it was so ironic that so many people I am sure unintentionally saying that no one would lose their job because I know it wasn't intentional because obviously they hadn't written the bill, they hadn't read the bill, they had their talking points. But if you read toward the back of the bill, I don't remember the page number, I had it here on the floor and was reading from it at the time, the bill itself created a fund to pay people who lost their job as a result of that crap-and-trade bill. Not only that, it created a fund that would help reimburse them travel expenses to help them move to where their jobs were going as a result of that bill.

So, whichever left wing organization wrote that bill, or whoever's staffer helped them write it, they knew people would lose their jobs right and left. That's why they were creating a fund in there. But my friends across the aisle had not read it. Apparently, the deliberative process from their standpoint was ram the stuff through, don't read it, don't get bothered with the actual provisions in the bill. Push it through, and we'll find out what's in it later. Apparently, that's deliberative. That's no bill to saddle America with. It means more lost jobs.

Now, we had another job fair last week in east Texas, this one in Nacogdoches. We had over 550 people attend, around four, five dozen employers that were there. Some people left

with jobs that didn't have them. Some people have hope for the future through the interview process.

And, normally, when you throw a party, you are really thrilled when people show up. But just as I saw in Marshall and Longview when we had a job fair there, and Lufkin, you look in the eyes of folks who have lost their jobs and you can't be pleased that the turnout is big because every one represents hurt, it represents lost finances, people struggling, many of them struggling for self-esteem because even though it wasn't their fault, so many get their strength and their pride from the job that they hold. And so it's very difficult to see so many people out of work.

But what I keep hearing also from businesses is the same thing, similar thing: they can't get credit, they can't get loans from their bank. Banks are telling them they're not going to extend their line of credit because they got regulators breathing down their throats. Because regulators, on instructions from this town are out there telling them, micromanaging, telling good community, solid community banks that were not the source of the problems—the source of the biggest problems were those on Wall Street that give four to one to Democrats. That was the big source, the investment banking firms, not the community banking firms. But the community banking firms, on instructions from those who were closest to the investment banking firms telling the regulators to go after them. And even hold them to having more in reserve than the law requires. Had that admission from regulators themselves.

And so people don't have capital because this obese monstrosity of a government that keeps growing can't control its appetite. And so it sucks up all the capital and throws it away on the government's pet projects.

□ 2150

It's no way to run a country. It's a way to lose a country.

Well, I didn't intend to spend that much time on the economy, but having heard so many comments from my friends across the aisle on what I believed and what I support, which were things that I simply do not, and have not supported, I had to address that.

But there are so many dangers in the world. One of them, of course, is this out-of-control spending. And one final thing on the economy, my friends across the aisle keep talking about how bad it's been since 2007, 2008, 2009. And the fact is they've been controlling everything but the White House since January of 2007. So when they took control and they let spending explode on their watch—they were right. They won the majority because Republicans did not control spending, and too many Republicans equated compassion with spending.

And so Democrats over and over, over and over came to the floor and

said, you know, a hundred billion, \$200 billion deficit in 1 year is outrageous. It shouldn't be allowed. We need to be in the majority so we'll control the spending. We'll cut the deficit. We'll get back on track. And so Republicans appropriately lost the majority because they had not controlled spending.

And what has happened since? Spending has gone through the roof. And under this administration, once the Democrats had the White House and both Houses with such huge majorities, spending became giddiness, and that hundred, \$200 billion deficit in a year has bloomed now to a \$1.5 trillion dollar deficit in a year. It's unbelievable.

And at the same time, it's been encouraging to see this administration in the past week show some friendliness toward our wonderful ally Israel, because all of the snubbing and pettiness by this administration in the way that it's treated Israel in conjunction with willing allies like *The New York Times*, like the 5,000-page editorial that was written about, there's just so much pettiness and snubbing of our friend Israel from this administration and its allies that they're hurting this Nation. Because when you hurt Israel, you hurt a true democracy in the middle of the Middle East, you hurt this country. You hurt any democracy when you hurt democracy that exists in the Middle East.

And I read this weekend an editorial written by Caroline Glick, and it's entitled, "Fit for *The New York Times*." And Caroline Glick is so articulate. I wanted to read verbatim what she had to say about the article in *The New York Times*. So I will read from Caroline Glick. This was published July 9, 2010.

She says, "Two important statements this week shed a light on the nature of the Palestinian conflict with Israel. Both were barely noted by the media.

"On Saturday the London-based *Al-Hayat* newspaper reported that Palestinian Authority Chairman Mahmoud Abbas gave U.S. mediator George Mitchell a letter detailing a number of concessions that he would make towards Israel in a final peace treaty. These included a willingness to accept permanent Israeli sovereignty over the Jewish Quarter in Jerusalem's Old City and over the Western Wall. The *Al-Hayat* report received enthusiastic and expansive coverage in the Israeli media and in media outlets throughout the world.

"What was barely noted was that just hours after the report hit the airwaves, Abbas's chief negotiator Saeb Erekat categorically denied the story. In an interview with Israel Radio, Saeb Erekat said the story was untrue.

"Abbas has been the recipient of adulatory press coverage in Israel over the past several days. Last week he thrilled the Hebrew-language media when he invited Israeli reporters to a sumptuous feast at his Ramallah head-

quarters. And then the *Al-Hayat* story came out. Lost in the excitement was Abbas's eulogy for arch terrorist Muhammad Daoud Oudeh who died over the weekend. Oudeh was the mastermind of the PLO's massacre of 11 Israeli athletes during the 1972 Munich Olympics. Abbas himself served the operation's paymaster.

"As Palestinian Media Watch reported, in a condolence telegram quoted in the Abbas-controlled *Al-Hayat al Jadida* newspaper, Abbas touted Oudeh as, 'a wonderful brother, companion, tough and stubborn, relentless fighter,' and described him as 'one of the prominent leaders of the Fatah movement.'

"So while the local and international media pounced on the *Al-Hayat* story as proof that the Palestinians are serious about peace, they failed to mention that their hope was based on a story that the Palestinians themselves deny. So too, in their rush to embrace Abbas, they failed to mention his glorification of an unrepentant mass murderer who commanded the terror squad that massacred Israel's Olympic athletes.

"These statements by Palestinian officials the media routinely characterize as moderates, demonstrates how deeply distorted and largely irrelevant the discourse on the Middle East has become. As the 'moderate' Palestinians insist they are uninterested in peaceful coexistence and territorial compromise with Israel, news coverage in Israel and throughout the Western world is dominated by other issues. Specifically, discussion of prospects for peace between Israel and the Palestinians is dominated by an endless discussion of Israel's Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria and Jewish neighborhoods in eastern, southern and northern Jerusalem.

"The most egregious recent example of this distortion was a 5,000 word article in Tuesday's *New York Times* regarding US charitable contributions to these Jewish communities. Titled, 'Tax Exempt Funds Aid Settlements in the West Bank,' the report was co-authored by five *Times* reporters. It was the product of weeks of research. And notably, the *New York Times* chose to publish it on its front page above the fold on the very day that Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu visited the White House.

"The *Times* article is a textbook case of the media's ideologically motivated aggression against Middle East reality. Any way you look at it, it is a premeditated affront to the very notion that the role of a newspaper is to report facts rather than manufacture news aimed at shaping perceptions and skewing debate.

"The article goes to great lengths to discredit the American citizens who make charitable, tax deductible donations to organizations that provide lawful support to Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria and Jewish neighborhoods in southern, northern and eastern Jerusalem. It paints a sinister picture of such contributions and

contributors and accuses them of actively undermining U.S. foreign policy.

"The contributors, we are told in the opening lines of the report are the Left's bogeyman—Evangelical Christians and religious Jews. They are unacceptable actors in the Middle East because they both believe that Jewish control of Judea and Samaria is a precursor to the coming of the messiah.

"Reacting to the Times' report, on Wednesday Honest Reporting noted that the article appears to be the product of active collusion between the Times and the radical, anti-Zionist, tax-exempt Gush Shalom organization. As Honest Reporting relays, in July of 2009, Gush Shalom sent out a communique to its supporters calling for the initiation of a campaign that, 'includes a combination of legal action and public advocacy aimed at denying Federal tax exempt (501c3) status to U.S. charities supporting settlement activity.'

"The Times' article bears all the markings of a political campaign. First, despite the valiant efforts of five Times reporters, the article exposes no illegal activity. At best, its investigation of more than forty organizations that contribute funds to the hated Jewish communities in Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria indicated that less than a handful of them are guilty of poor accounting practices."

□ 2200

Assuming that Honest Reporting's eminently reasonable conclusion that the Times report is the product of collaboration between the newspaper and radical anti-Zionist groups is accurate, the report is shockingly hypocritical. By publishing it, the New York Times is engaging in the precise behavior it argues the organizations it investigated should be punished for purportedly engaging in.

To wit, in the service of radical tax deductible organizations, the Times seeks to undermine U.S. foreign policy. For the past four decades, it has been the foreign policy of the United States to maintain a strategic alliance with Israel. The goal of Times-aligned groups like Gush Shalom is to undermine that alliance by discrediting and criminalizing those who wish to strengthen and maintain it.

The Times article uses dark language and innuendo to create the impression that there is something treacherous and evil about contributions to Jewish communities in neighborhoods in Judea, Samaria and Jerusalem.

For instance, the article argues, "The donations to the settler movement stand out from other charitable, and this is in brackets, from other charitable contributions that promote U.S. foreign policy goals, close brackets, because of the centrality of the settlement issue in the current talks and the fact that Washington has consistently refused to allow Israel to spend American government aid in the settlements. Tax breaks for the donations remain largely unchallenged and

unexamined by the American government."

What the Times fails to acknowledge is that the reason these donations are "largely unchallenged and unexamined" is because it is the constitutional right of American citizens to contribute to charities that promote policy goals, even when those goals, like those of Gush Shalom, are antithetical to U.S. policy as determined by the U.S. Government.

The New York Times alleges that these communities are illegal. Its authority for this allegation is none other than the Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat. Erekat opined to the paper, "Settlements violate international law."

The truth is that Israeli communities beyond the 1949 armistice lines are legal. But even if one were to accept the argument that they are unlawful, one would be accepting an argument based on the language of the Fourth Geneva Convention from 1949 which prevents occupying powers from transferring their population to the areas under occupation.

There is no possible reading of the convention that would prohibit the voluntary movement of Israelis to Judea, Samaria and post-1967 neighborhoods in Jerusalem. Likewise, there is no possible reading of the convention that would prohibit the provision of financial support to Israelis who voluntarily move to the areas in question. Yet it is precisely this indisputably lawful, voluntary movement of Jews to these areas which the Times acknowledges is often done against the wishes of Israel's government that the Times article attacks.

In short, the Times' contention that there is something legally problematic about these donations is preposterous, both as it relates to U.S. law and as it relates to international law.

From a journalistic perspective, worse than the Times' decision to engage in precisely the behavior it seeks to criminalize when carried out by its political nemesis on the Christian and Jewish right and worse even than the article's false characterization of law is the article's clear attempt to obfuscate the main problem with land issues in Judea and Samaria. This it does in the interests of manufacturing a false but ideologically sympathetic picture of the situation on the ground.

The Times only gets around to alluding to and obfuscating the real problem with the land issues in the 58th paragraph of the article. The Times reports "Islamic judicial panels have threatened death to Palestinians who sell property in the occupied territories to Jews."

Actually, while this may be true, it is not the problem. The problem is that the second law promulgated by the Palestinian Authority just weeks after it was established in 1994 criminalized all Arab land sales to Jews as a capital crime.

Since 1994, scores of Arabs have been killed in both judicial and extrajudicial

executions for selling land to Jews. This open move to hide the fact that since 1994 the PA has dispatched death squads to murder both Palestinians and Israeli Arabs suspected of selling land to Jews is a shocking miscarriage of journalistic standards.

Whereas the New York Times required five reporters to work for weeks to come up with exactly nothing illegal in the operations of U.S. charitable groups that support Jewish communities the Times wishes to destroy, the Times would have needed to invest no resources whatsoever to discover that the PA kills any Arab who sells land to Jews. The PA has made no effort to hide this policy. It is in the public sphere for anyone willing to look at reality.

That is, of course, the real issue here. The entire New York Times investigation, so-called, of American charitable groups that support Jewish communities in neighborhoods in Judea, Samaria and Jerusalem is a blatant attempt by major newspaper to hide the real issues prolonging the Palestinian conflict with Israel. Those issues exposed by Abbas's praise for a terrorist mass murderer, Erekat's denial that Abbas has any interest in compromising with Israel, as well as by the PA's policy of killing all Arabs who sell lands to Jews, do not serve the Times' purpose of blaming the absence of peace on Israel generally and on the Israeli right and its supporters in the U.S. in particular.

And so it is that 17 years after the start of the so-called peace process between Israel and the PLO, and 10 years after the PLO destroyed that process by launching a terror war against Israel, and 4½ years after the Palestinians elected Hamas to lead them, we are still stuck in a distorted, irrelevant discourse about the Middle East.

We are stuck in a rut because politically and ideologically motivated media organs operate hand-in-glove with radical groups seeking to undermine Israel's national sovereignty and end its alliance with the U.S. Together, they manufacture news that bears no relation with reality or the true challenges facing those who seek peace in the Middle East. But obviously for the New York Times, that is what makes it fit to print.

That was posted July 9, 2010, 7:27 a.m. by my friend Caroline Glick.

□ 2210

The article speaks for itself. It is a sad day when the New York Times has become such a political hack of a newspaper that in the summer of 1973, when I was in the Soviet Union, it was exciting. Actually, got a chance of going over there through Europe, coming out through Europe, to see a New York Times, especially in English. Exciting. And it was trusted to be the international resource. So it is a bit heart-breaking that as its sales circulation continues to plummet, it continues to lose money, that it continues to proceed with the very things that have

brought down its reputation and hurt it as such an objective resource. Doing reports growing up as a kid, you knew you could count on anything that you found in the New York Times and cite it as a valuable and accurate resource. Not so anymore. Not so anymore.

Israel is a friend, and I'm grateful that democracy has worked to the extent that this administration got concerned about its plummeting numbers enough that it realized maybe this time it should treat the Prime Minister of Israel with some respect, just as it is and just as it has heads of states of countries that despise us and have said they would be glad to see us fall as a Nation. It's nice if they could treat Prime Minister Netanyahu with the same respect that it treats some of our sworn enemies.

Very interesting. There's just so much to cover, so little time. But I did want to address that issue and the fact that Iran is continuing to have its centrifuges spin. It has been reported by this administration, by the IAEA, that Iran has apparently at least enough uranium material, at least, to manufacture two nuclear weapons. So the rhetorical question to be asked, How many nuclear bombs does it take to become an existential threat to Israel or to this Nation? I would submit a nuke in New York Harbor, coming up the Potomac, the Houston and New Orleans shipping channel taking out the majority of our energy resources, Los Angeles, the lake right up next to Chicago, the effect could be existential to the U.S.

This isn't a game. You can't keep walking around blaming the prior administration. Yes, I was upset with the Bush administration with the TARP. Yes, this administration went right out and hired the same people that helped push that thing through. And they're still pushing it. Still like it. Should have never been passed. That was a huge mistake by the Bush administration, and we should not continue to confound it.

Well, just as we've seen the New York Times can twist and distort, we've seen throughout America people distorting our heritage. And so in an effort to correct yet another distortion, I want to finish with this. This is from a book written by Peter Lillback, "Wall of Misconception." A small book, lots of resources. Dr. Lillback says: "Everyone agrees that George Washington was critical for the formation of America's values. Washington was conscious that his every act created a precedent for good or ill for all that would follow him. As our first President, everything he did established precedents for how our country was to work."

"So there is no accident that so many have sought to portray Washington as a man without faith. For if he exercised faith in the public square, this in turn argues that the Judeo-Christian system still has relevance and vitality in the public square today.

Did Washington's legacy include strong precedents of advocating the Judeo-Christian values in the public square? Recent authors have declared an emphatic no.

"Randall writes, 'Washington was not a deeply religious man.' Douglas Southall Freeman says, 'He had believed that a God directed his path, but he had not been particularly ardent in his faith.' James Thomas Flexner states that 'Washington . . . avoided, as was his deist custom, the word "God."' Judging from these writers, Washington could hardly be called a 'godly leader.' But are these claims correct?"

I could go on, as I have, taking people on tours through this building for about 2 or 3 hours with what Washington wrote and said and did. But continuing Dr. Lillback's book: "The very men who gave us the First Amendment did not intend to impose a radical separation of church and State that is advocated by so many today. In fact, the day after Congress adopted the words of the First Amendment, they sent a message to President Washington asking him to declare a day of thanksgiving to show America's appreciation to God for the opportunity to create America's new national government in peace and tranquility."

"So on October 3, 1789, President Washington made a Proclamation of a National Day of Thanksgiving. He declared: Whereas it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the Providence of Almighty God"—I guess he did use the word God—"to obey His will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor. And, whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me 'to recommend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God'"—oops, he used it again—"especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness, now, therefore, I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the people of the United States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be; that we may then all unite in rendering unto Him our sincere and humble thanks, for His kind care and protection of the people of this country previous to their becoming a Nation; for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of His providence, which we experienced in the course and conclusion of the late war; for the great degree of tranquility, union, and plenty, which we have since enjoyed, for the peaceable and rational manner in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national one now lately instituted, for the civil and religious

liberty with which we are blessed, and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and in general for the great and various favors which He hath been pleased to confer upon us.

"And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations, and beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions to enable us all—and deists doesn't ask God to enable us to do anything—whether in public or private stations to perform our several relative duties properly and punctually."

I see my time is running out so I will go straight to the bottom of George Washington's words: "to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the increase of science among them and us; and generally to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best."

"Given under my hand, at the City of New York, the 3rd of October, in the year of our Lord, 1789." Again, George Washington's words.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I yield back.

□ 2220

EXTENDING AMERICA'S UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the egregious actions taken by both the House and Senate against unemployed Americans. Members of this body have continued to vote against extending benefits to millions of Americans who need it the most right now. While these citizens are facing the worst job market that this Nation has seen in generations, these Members have turned their backs on them. They claim that the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act is budget-busting legislation. Madam Speaker, any bill whose intention is to assist 14.7 million jobless Americans while adding a needed infusion of cash into our still fragile economy is not budget-busting legislation. It is the right legislation.

Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has claimed that the Republicans continue to block the extension of unemployment benefits because they are not "willing to use worthwhile programs as an excuse" to create "even bigger national debt than we've already got." Where were these same Republicans when we began our descent into fiscal disarray? Where were the Republicans when our national debt doubled when they had control of the White House and Congress? Where were the Republicans in stopping this atrocity from taking place?

And with that, I would like to put a chart up that some of my former colleagues used to show where we were

and where we came from. In western Pennsylvania, where I'm from, many times I've been taught over the years that you have to look back to see where you were to know where you're going. And I think this chart shows pretty dramatically where we were just a decade ago and where the last administration brought us.

Republicans have made a political calculation and decided to present this as a debate about our national debt. If we look back at history, we can see this new mantra of fiscal responsibility heralded by the Republican Party of today was not what they lived by a few years ago. Our national debt grew to enormous numbers because of actions Republicans have taken in the past decade. Let us not forget, when President Bush came into office in 2001, he inherited a \$236 billion budget surplus, 2.4 percent of our total GDP. This was the first surplus of this magnitude in the history of our country. These surpluses were projected to continue for at least the next 10 years.

According to a Congressional Budget Office report on the Economic Outlook for the Next Decade published in January of 2000, if the policies in place under President Clinton were maintained, total surpluses would have accumulated to between \$3.2 and \$4.2 trillion over the next 10 years. With these surpluses, it was projected that the Treasury would have sufficient cash on hand sometime between 2007 and 2009 to retire all debt held by the public. Now, let me read that to you again. With these surpluses, it was projected that the Treasury would have sufficient cash on hand sometime between 2007 and 2009 to retire all debt held by the public.

Madam Speaker, we've come a long way from the days of President Clinton, and it's been under the Republican leadership that this descent has taken place. As a country, we were on a path towards true fiscal responsibility and recovery. Rather than demand that we use these funds to eradicate our national debt then, Republicans dwindled our surplus on unpaid programs that greatly benefited the wealthiest citizens in our Nation. The Economic Growth—and I love the title—the Economic Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act of 2001 passed the Republican Congress and was signed by President Bush, and it was an unpaid tax cut for the rich.

The CBO revised its economic outlook at the beginning of 2002 to reflect the changes in spending policy that have taken place during President Bush's first year. Although they still projected surpluses, the total amount had dropped by \$4 trillion under the prior year's estimate; \$2.4 trillion, or 60 percent, of that decline was attributed to laws enacted in 2001, including the Bush tax cuts. When the tax policy was studied for its long-term impact on our national budget, it was determined that the plan would cost us \$1.35 trillion over 10 years. At the end of fiscal

year 2002, we reported our first budget deficit since 1997 in the amount of \$157.8 billion. Even then, there were no trumpets sounded by the Republicans to reverse our spending habits to pay down the national debt. In fact, they continued to embrace policies that would lead us deeper and deeper into the financial black hole we see ourselves in today.

In 2003, there was a second round of major tax cuts enacted. The law accelerated previous provisions from the 2001 cuts while enacting new terms. Here we go with these great titles. The Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 was projected to increase Federal budget deficits by \$349.7 billion in the next 10 years. From 2001 to 2008, the Republicans added \$4.9 trillion to our national debt, bringing it to a total of \$10.6 trillion by the time President Obama took office. The Republican leadership was able to turn a projected \$4 trillion surplus into a nearly \$5 trillion budget deficit in a matter of 8 years.

Madam Speaker, 2008 was a trying year for all Americans. We witnessed a dramatic dip in housing prices, a skyrocketing number of foreclosed homes, the failing of financial institutions, what appeared to be a full collapse of our banking system, and the loss of 3.1 million American jobs by the end of the year. It was a catastrophe on a magnitude this Nation had not seen in decades. The economic meltdown prompted President Bush's Treasury Secretary Paulson and Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke to visit the Speaker's Office on Thursday, September 18 of that year to deliver information to congressional leaders on our country's dire economic situation.

The Treasury Secretary and Chairman of the Fed described how, under the Bush administration, our economy had reached the equivalent of driving a tanker off of Allegheny Mountain. They believed that a serious government intervention was needed in order to rescue the system. On Saturday, September 20, a mere 2 days after this briefing, the Treasury Department delivered a three-page proposal to Congress asking for \$700 billion and giving the Secretary authority to purchase mortgage-related assets from any financial institution.

In a hearing held by the House Financial Services Committee on the financial crisis, Secretary Paulson stated this major outlay of government money was needed to restore confidence in our financial markets and financial institutions so that they can perform their mission of supporting future prosperity and growth. The CBO estimated that the bill, signed by President Bush on October 4, 2008, in its entirety, including several tax provisions added on to it, would increase the national debt by \$814 billion.

In the 8 years that President Bush and his administration led this country, they doubled our national debt. Not once did Republicans stand up to

say the Bush administration and the Republican-controlled Congress were responsible for this. But now when Americans are in need of help, the Republicans refuse to offer it.

The financial crisis left a lasting effect on our country. Not only were Wall Street and our Nation's financial institutions left in disarray, but millions of Americans were left without jobs. Our unemployment rate jumped to 7.4 percent at the end of December 2008 and now stands over 9 percent. Americans are suffering because of this crisis and are in dire need of assistance, yet Republicans believe that it is politically astute to deny millions of American families the aid they need to put food on their tables while searching for a job during this difficult time.

When the House took up the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act on July 1, it passed by a 270–153 vote. It is wonderful that 270 Members of this body see the needs of the people and are appropriately providing for them, yet 80 percent of the Republicans in the House opted to continue being the party of “no.”

□ 2230

Nearly all Republicans in the Senate decided to do the same. They continue to turn their backs on American families in need.

Republicans believe that this is all in the name of fiscal responsibility. How is denying Americans needed funding to support their families fiscally irresponsible?

Not only do these funds help American families, they help the American economy. One reason there is not enough jobs right now is weak consumer demand. CBO has found that extending unemployment benefits to be one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy.

Every dollar in unemployment benefits creates at least \$1.64 in economic activity, as opposed to the 29 cents the Bush tax cuts would generate if extended, according to chief economist Mark Zandi of moodys.com. Virtually every dollar from unemployment benefits would be quickly spent on living expenses with the purchase of goods and services.

The CBO projected that the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010 would cost \$33 billion, which works out to be about \$2,200 per unemployed person of those 14.7 million people. This is roughly seven-thousandths of 1 percent of the debt amassed by the Republicans under the Bush administration. Yet the Republicans now want to claim fiscal responsibility. Providing these benefits is fiscally responsible and, more than that, it's a moral responsibility.

In the month of May, the State of Pennsylvania had a 9.1 percent unemployment rate. And in my area in southwest Pennsylvania we see many counties that are still hovering around the 10 percent market. While I was in the district over this past week I heard

many stories about families and how they're hurting while I was around visiting them.

At a senior center I talked to a young woman whose husband used to work in one of the factories in Johnstown. He worked there for 30 years. They paid their taxes. They did everything that they were supposed to do. Now his unemployment benefits are running out, but the Republican Members in this body and in the Senate feel it's not important enough to pass the emergency unemployment benefits.

One unemployed constituent lost her car because she's unable to make her payments once she stopped receiving the benefits in June. She's now left to find a job with no means of transportation, but that's not important enough for the folks in this body.

I received this letter last week from one of my constituents who desperately needs Congress to pass the unemployment extension. Her letter reads, "I am writing this message to tell you about the harm that failure to extend unemployment is causing for my family. Both my husband and I lost jobs through no fault of our own, like millions of other Americans. We have worked hard and paid taxes for a combined total of 71 years; two of these include my husband's 2 years in the military service.

"We have tried to get work since being laid off over a year and a half ago. My husband has worked for the Census." Remember, those are some of those jobs that have been noted that they're not real jobs. "My husband has worked for the Census a few weeks each of these past 2 years, but that will end soon. I have tried to get work during the past 2 years, but so far have not found anything. I have read that for every job that opens in Pennsylvania, there are five workers that would need it.

"We feel that we have been let down. Our country has bailed out companies and banks, and has saved high-paying jobs and bonuses, but feels it is too expensive to continue to help the unemployed. Some say that there are jobs out there that people aren't taking. I would like to know what they are and especially whether they are jobs that my husband and I could do."

Now, this is western Pennsylvania. The people in my district want to work. Sometimes there isn't work though, and they need the help that these unemployment benefits offer. And it really, it hurts my feelings and

it angers me that this body can turn that kind of help down.

"Most of our 71 years of work have been in public libraries, which are hurting more than any other service from huge cuts by the State and local governments.

"I don't know how Congressmen and Senators can take a break when millions of Americans' lives are on hold. We can't make the rent or mortgage, pay for prescription drugs, feed and clothe our children, put gas into our cars so that we can continue to look for jobs and many other necessities."

And just as a side note, before I continue the speech that my staff and I put together, in western Pennsylvania we've seen the loss of jobs over many years. It used to be the hub of the steel industry of this country. Well, steel left in the late seventies and early eighties, and we've been fighting to create jobs in western Pennsylvania for a long time. We're a very hard working people. We do the best job that we can.

And why I'm so angered by the rhetoric that's been thrown around about this unemployment extension of unemployment benefits is these are hard working people, and if the jobs were there they'd be working. They're not looking for any kind of handout. But sometimes you need help, and that's all they're asking for.

She goes on to say, "I would like for you to share this letter with other Congressmen and Senators. I hope that you will all realize that we did not ask for this situation and would be glad to return to work if only we could.

"The unemployed need help and we need it fast. Please work as hard as you can to get our benefits back."

Madam Speaker, these families, like millions of other American families, need our help. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to pass the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act and provide our citizens the help they require in this time of crisis.

And again, let me reference where we were and then where we went.

This is not budget busting. This is helping men and women who are in need.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, July 14, 15, 16, 19, and 20.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, July 14, 15, and 16.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today, July 14, 15, 16, 19, and 20.

Mr. UPTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today, July 14, 15, 16, 19, and 20.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and July 14.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on July 1, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 5611. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5623. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the homebuyer tax credit for the purchase of a principal residence before October 1, 2010, in the case of a written binding contract entered into with respect to such principal residence before May 1, 2010, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5569. To extend the National Flood Insurance Program until September 30, 2010.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 14, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the fourth quarter of 2009 and the second quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 7 AND DEC. 22, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Cary Lane	12/17/09	12/19/09	Denmark		4,010.00		(³)				4,010.00
This is an amendment to report of 1/19/10											
Committee total					4,010.00						4,010.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, June 18, 2010.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO QATAR, AFGHANISTAN, GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 6 AND MAY 10, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/7	5/8	Qatar		227.00		(³)				227.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(³)				341.00
Hon. Donna Edwards	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(³)				341.00
Hon. Niki Tsongas	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(³)				341.00
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(³)				341.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	5/7	5/8	Qatar		280.00		(³)				280.00
Wyndee Parker	5/7	5/8	Qatar		291.00		(³)				291.00
Bridget Fallon	5/7	5/9	Qatar		682.00		(³)				682.00
Kate Knudson	5/7	5/9	Qatar		682.00		(³)				682.00
Brendan Daly	5/7	5/8	Qatar		277.31		(³)				277.31
Debra Wada	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(³)				341.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(³)				
Hon. Susan Davis	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Donna Edwards	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Niki Tsongas	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(³)				
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan		28.00		(³)				28.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(³)				
Wyndee Parker	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan		10.00		(³)				10.00
Brendan Daly	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(³)				
Debra Wada	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(³)				
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/9	5/10	Germany		87.00		(³)				87.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/9	5/10	Germany		177.25		(³)				177.25
Hon. Donna Edwards	5/9	5/10	Germany		177.25		(³)				177.25
Hon. Niki Tsongas	5/9	5/10	Germany		107.25		(³)				107.25
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	5/9	5/10	Germany		177.25		(³)				177.25
Wilson Livingood	5/9	5/10	Germany		116.25		(³)				116.25
Wyndee Parker	5/9	5/10	Germany		96.87		(³)				96.87
Bridget Fallon	5/9	5/10	Germany		230.50		³ 908.00				1,138.50
Kate Knudson	5/9	5/10	Germany		230.50		³ 908.00				1,138.50
Brendan Daly	5/9	5/10	Germany		53.25		(³)				53.25
Debra Wada	5/9	5/10	Germany		85.25		(³)				85.25
Committee total											7,592.93

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, June 18, 2010.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8258. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin; Order Amending Marketing Order No. 930 [Doc. No.: AO-370-A8; AMS-FV-06-0213; FV07-930-2] received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8259. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2010-2011 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0082; FV10-985-1 FR] received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8260. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, Et al.; Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2009-2010 Crop Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0069; FV09-930-2 FR] received June 22, 2010,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8261. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Change in the Handling Regulation [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0033; FV09-923-1 FR] received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8262. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Increase Membership [Document Number: AMS-FV-09-0022; FV-09-705] received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8263. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rates [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0091; FV10-916/917-2 FR] received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8264. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Citrus Greening and Asian Citrus Psyllid; Quarantine and Interstate Movement Regulations [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-

0015] (RIN: 0579-AC85) received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8265. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting A Request For Budget Amendments For Fiscal Year 2010 proposals in the Fiscal Year 2011 Budget for the Department of Homeland Security and Justice; (H. Doc. No. 111—130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8266. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Pararamid Fibers and Yarns Manufactured in Qualifying Country (DFARS Case 2008-D024) (RIN: 0750-AG13) received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 45th report required by the FY 2000 Emergency Supplemental Act, pursuant to Public Law 106-246, section 3204(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8268. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the annual certification of the nuclear weapons stockpile by the Secretaries of Defense and Energy and accompanying report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8269. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-000; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8123] received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8270. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's "Major" final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers [Regulation E; Docket No.: R-1343] received July 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8271. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act: Pre-existing Condition Exclusions, Lifetime and Annual Limits, Rescissions, and Patient Protections (RIN: 1210-AB43) received June 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8272. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-05, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8273. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-11, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8274. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-06, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8275. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-18, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8276. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-21, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8277. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 10-008, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, section 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8278. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 10-056, pursuant to Public Law 110-429, section 201; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8279. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's letter in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8280. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of Justification and report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8281. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Report on Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Non-proliferation and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments for July 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8282. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of the report entitled, "Auditor's Certification of the District Department of Transportation's FY 2008 Performance Accountability Report", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8283. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's strategic Plan for FY 2010 — 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8284. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8285. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8286. A letter from the Deputy Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8287. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's semiannual report from the Office of the Inspector General during the 6-month period ending March 31, 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8288. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting Semiannual Management Report from the office of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8289. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports for the 6-month period ending March 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8290. A letter from the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8291. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8292. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Amendment to Emergency Fisheries Closure in the Gulf of Mexico Due to the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill [Docket No.: 100503210-0215-01] (RIN: 0648-AY87) received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8293. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Final Rulemaking To Establish Take Prohibitions for the Threatened Southern Distinct Population Segment of North American Green Sturgeon [Docket No.: 070910507-

0037-02] (RIN: 0648-AV94) received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8294. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded \$5 million for the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3309-EM in the State of North Dakota, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8295. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Automatic Dependent Surveillance — Broadcast (ADS-B) Out Performance Requirements To Support Air Traffic Control (ATC) Service; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29305; Amdt. No. 91-314-A] (RIN: 2120-AI92) received June 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8296. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Automatic Dependent Surveillance — Broadcast (ADS-B) Out Performance Requirements To Support Air Traffic Control (ATC) Service; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29305; Amdt. No. 91-316] (RIN: 2120-AI92) received June 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8297. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30728; Amdt. No. 3377] received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8298. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Transportation for Individuals with Disabilities: Passenger Vessels [Docket: OST-2007-26829] (RIN: 2105-AB87) received June 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8299. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., transmitting proceedings of the 110th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Phoenix, Arizona, August 15-20, 2009, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 118 and 44 U.S.C. 1332; (H. Doc. No. 111—131); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

8300. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., transmitting proceedings of the 109th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Orlando, Florida, August 16-21, 2008, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 118 and 44 U.S.C. 1332; (H. Doc. No. 111—132); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

8301. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for Several Body System Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2010-0021] (RIN: 0960-AH20) received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8302. A letter from the Deputy Associate Commissioner of Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Hearing Loss

[Docket No.: SSA-2008-0016] (RIN: 0960-AG20) received June 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3923. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the state of Colorado, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3967. A bill to amend the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 to authorize appropriations through fiscal year 2015 (Rept. 111-526 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4514. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4686. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System; with amendments (Rept. 111-528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3989. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of adding the Heart Mountain Relocation Center, in the State of Wyoming, as a unit of the National Park System (Rept. 111-529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4773. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands within Fort Pulaski National Monument, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4973. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize volunteer programs and community partnerships for national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2864. A bill to amend the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 to authorize funds to acquire hydrographic data and provide hydrographic services specific to the Arctic for safe navigation, delineating the United States extended continental shelf, and the monitoring and description of coastal changes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2476. A bill to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Ag-

riculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System land that are subject to ski area permits, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-533 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2555. A bill to ensure the availability and affordability of homeowners' insurance coverage for catastrophic events; with an amendment (Rept. 111-534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1509. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1722) to improve teleworking in executive agencies by developing a telework program that allows employees to telework at least 20 percent of the hours worked in every 2 administrative workweeks, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-535). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3967 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 5711. A bill to provide for the furnishing of statues by the territories of the United States for display in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STARK, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 5712. A bill to provide for certain clarifications and extensions under Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 5713. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to extend to private property owners and managers in the City of Fredericksburg and the counties of Caroline, King George, Spotsylvania, and Stafford in Virginia the same preferences in negotiating for the leasing of space for the use of the Federal government that are given to private property owners and managers in jurisdictions in the National Capital region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. KILROY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. STARK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 5714. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit the inclusion of Social Security account numbers on Medicare cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 5715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish lifelong learning accounts to provide an incentive for employees to save for career-related skills development and to promote a competitive workforce through lifelong learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

H.R. 5716. A bill to provide for enhancement of existing efforts in support of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities to advance technologies for the safe and environmentally responsible exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas resources; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 5717. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a facility and to enter into agreements relating to education programs at the National Zoological Park facility in Front Royal, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 5718. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to restrict the ability of a person whose Federal license to import, manufacture, or deal in firearms has been revoked, whose application to renew such a license has been denied, or who has received a license revocation or renewal denial notice, to transfer business inventory firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 5719. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop, and the Secretary of Defense to distribute to members of the Armed Forces upon their discharge or release from active duty, information in a compact disk read-only memory format or other appropriate digital format that lists and explains the health, education, and other benefits for which veterans are eligible under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DJOU:

H.R. 5720. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1227 Lunailo Street, Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Cecil L. Heftel Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DJOU:

H.R. 5721. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 335 Merchant Street, Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Frank F. Fasi Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DRIEHAUS:

H.R. 5722. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide reimbursement for certain services relating to an approved letter of map amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 5723. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Broadway in Lynbrook, New York, as the "Navy Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H.R. 5724. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Federal responsibility for stormwater pollution; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 5725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal taxes on the income of senior citizens and to improve income security of senior citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5726. A bill to improve the management and oversight of Federal contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 5727. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the establishment of a process for quickly and effectively soliciting, assessing, and deploying offshore oil and hazardous substance cleanup technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 5728. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the "Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. REBERG, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 5729. A bill to modernize authorities to fight and win the war of ideas against violent extremist ideologies over the internet and other mediums of information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H. Res. 1510. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4636) to prohibit United States assistance to foreign countries that oppose the position of the United States in the United Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. REYES):

H. Res. 1511. A resolution honoring the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission on the 10th anniversary of the full commission establishment and for a decade of significant contributions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by

the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KILROY, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. WU):

H. Res. 1512. A resolution commending Google Inc. and other companies for advocating for an uncensored Internet, adhering to free speech principles, and keeping the Internet open for users worldwide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Res. 1513. A resolution congratulating the Saratoga Race Course as it celebrates its 142nd season; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 1514. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 31, 2010, as National Dance Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 147: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 211: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 275: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 303: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 305: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WU, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 391: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 413: Mr. LEE of New York.
H.R. 745: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 764: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 832: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 855: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1067: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1205: Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1230: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 1305: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1322: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1403: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1443: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1547: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1597: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 1625: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 1806: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1835: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1924: Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 2000: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2067: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 2103: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2135: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2149: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2159: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2349: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2378: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2408: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2455: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 2624: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2693: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2766: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2866: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2882: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HARE, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2979: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 2982: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 3039: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 3077: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3163: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 3249: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3251: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 3264: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3367: Mr. WU and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 3408: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. HODES, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3488: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3554: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 3564: Mr. WEINER and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3567: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3577: Mr. PETRI and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 3595: Ms. FALLIN and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3668: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 3693: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 3716: Mr. BARROW, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3724: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 3729: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3742: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3781: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 4116: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4148: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 4190: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4197: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4278: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 4296: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 4298: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4306: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 4324: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4359: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4399: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 4420: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4544: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4553: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4557: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4558: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4599: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 4611: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 4629: Mr. WU.
H.R. 4653: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4662: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4677: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4692: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4693: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4710: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 4734: Mr. WU.
H.R. 4759: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4787: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4796: Mr. PAUL, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4800: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4806: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 4820: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4830: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4864: Mr. HARE, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4870: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 4886: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4914: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4925: Mr. CHILDERS.
H.R. 4926: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 4947: Mr. McCOTTER and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 4999: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 5012: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 5032: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 5040: Mr. CLAY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 5041: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5081: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 5090: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 5092: Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 5107: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 5115: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 5121: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 5141: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 5211: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 5218: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 5244: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 5248: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 5268: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 5283: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 5289: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 5295: Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 5319: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 5322: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 5323: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BARTLETT, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 5418: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 5424: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 5425: Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 5429: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5434: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5458: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 5467: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5504: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 5506: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 5509: Mr. FORBES and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5510: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 5518: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 5523: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 5527: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 5563: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 5564: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 5565: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 5566: Mr. TONKO and Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 5577: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 5578: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 5580: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 5588: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 5597: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 5605: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5606: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5614: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. KRATOVIL.

H.R. 5620: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 5631: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5634: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 5636: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5643: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 5644: Mr. STARK, Ms. HIRONO, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 5648: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 5679: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 5687: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 5694: Mr. HONDA.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. DJOU.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. SESSIONS.

H. Con. Res. 232: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. OLVER.

H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BOREN.

H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. BONNER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BRIGHT, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H. Con. Res. 287: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DJOU, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MACK, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H. Con. Res. 291: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. INSLEE.

H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. POSEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. OLSON.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. WEINER.

H. Con. Res. 296: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BOREN, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 20: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 22: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 111: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H. Res. 173: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KIND, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 249: Mr. DJOU.

H. Res. 709: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 771: Mr. SIREN and Mr. HUNTER.

H. Res. 869: Mr. TIAHRT.

H. Res. 874: Mr. TIAHRT.

H. Res. 1052: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. KRATOVIL.

H. Res. 1217: Mr. COHEN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Res. 1241: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H. Res. 1326: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 1342: Mr. SCHRADER.

H. Res. 1355: Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 1370: Mr. DOYLE.

H. Res. 1401: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SESTAK.

H. Res. 1402: Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 1411: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. BERMAN.

H. Res. 1420: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Res. 1423: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H. Res. 1443: Mr. HONDA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 1445: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H. Res. 1472: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. MAFFEL.

H. Res. 1473: Mr. BRIGHT.

H. Res. 1483: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. HILL.

H. Res. 1485: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H. Res. 1488: Mr. PAUL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. WU.

H. Res. 1494: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. INSLEE.

H. Res. 1497: Mr. KIRK.

H. Res. 1503: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative Waters, or a designee, to H.R. 5114, the Flood Insurance Reform Priorities Act of 2010, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.